BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III. **January, 1906.** **No. 1.**

FOUR EARLY SEPARATISTIC CHURCHES IN LONDON.

BY REV. W. T. WHITLEY, LL. D.,

Member of the American Historical Association, Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

This story has usually been told by Congregationalists, who naturally have viewed the facts from their own standpoint, and have passed lightly over all that did not lead to regular Congregational Churches. Especially have they in charity passed over the frequent and lamentable falls from grace, when their members and whole churchs adopted Anabaptist heresies! Yet in this way they lose all continuity in the story, and tantalise the reader who wants a real history, irrespective of sympathy with the parties. And Baptists generally are ignorant how the principles of Separatism led again and again to the formation of Baptist churches, as Anglicans warned the Separatists in vain.

For three years past the writer has had more opportunities of following up a study which has long interested him. He has been especially aided by making a transcript of the Gould manuscript, embodying so many gleanings from the early records of these churches. American students seem to have been chiefly fascinated by one problem, the act of baptism and the date 1641; and, as a subsidiary question, the trustworthiness of the Gould manuscript. On the latter point the writer satisfied himself some while ago, and is glad that Mr. Champlin Burrage has laid much evidence before the world; a few further notes are appended to the present paper. The main

object here, however, is to piece together from this and other sources some kind of story as to the early churches in London which broke off all connection with the Establishment. Americans will be glad to see that some of their early churches sprang from this movement. Baptists will be glad to see that nearly all which can be traced, became Baptist.

But first, we have to ask why the new phenomenon of Separatism appeared after the Reformation. In Catholic days, if any man was not satisfied with the elaborate parish system that covered all England with a series of churches, he could enter a brotherhood that recognized the right of every man to worship. There was the ancient order of Benedictines, the French Cistercians, the Italian Franciscans, the Spanish Dominicans, and even a few native associations like the Gilbertines. Now under Henry VIII. these had all been swept away, and no vent was left for a religious spirit except dumb attendance on the mass performed by the parish priest. Soon this was found inadequate, and English Bibles were placed in the churches for the laymen to read. When an English service was provided, and a new standard of doctrine was published in XLII articles, the council of Edward procured the first Act of Uniformity.

This was an impossible ideal, and it led to two kinds of opposition; non-conformity and separatism. Clergy in the ranks of the Establishment did not behave uniformly, and so became the first Non-conformists. Be it remembered that this phrase meant for a century, clergy who within the official church disobeyed the law and declined to conform to its rules. Laymen who were not tempted to compromise with conscience, simply started supplementary services in private dwellings, like Wesley at a later time, or the Church Army to-day. Within a year of the Act, two congregations were found in Kent and Essex, which the historian contemptuously dismisses as of Anabaptistical tendencies.

The accession of Mary changed all this, and the men who wished to continue using Edward's prayer-book now

found themselves in a sense separatists. Modern Congregationalists who have claimed the community of Rough and Sympson as their ancestors, are evidently unaware that the first pastor, Scambler, became Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and the last, Bentham, became in 1559 Lord Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.

When Elizabeth came to the throne, the great bulk of the nation agreed in the general principle of no toleration, and another Act of Uniformity passed readily. It remained to be settled whether the pattern should be Roman or Genevan or Elizabethan. Meantime the act was not enforced seriously, except on the bishops, who to their honor resigned when they saw the Roman system doomed. John Calvin at Geneva had worked out in opposition to the Anabaptists, a system of theology of marvelous logical consistency, which captivated all thinking Protestants in his native France, down the Rhine, and in Britain. He also got some kind of Church-government to work in Geneva, which was adapted to national purposes in France. The notes in the Genevan Bible, which became the authorized version of Scotland, treated this system as if it were inspired, and soon there appeared a doctrine of the Divine Right of Presbyterianism. Between this on the one hand, and the contempt of the venerable hierarchy of Rome, the new Elizabethan bishops were fain to petition Parliament to declare that they were lawful. Nobody seems to have thought they would maintain their ground, with doctrine from Wittenberg but a governmental system inherited from Rome; so all the Puritan clergy were anxious to temporize till they could legalize their system. When the Pope finally ordered Catholics to abandon the parish churches, Puritans might reasonably hope that Elizabeth would be thrown into their arms. So they took to publishing elaborate books, and imitated the Scotch in instituting voluntary Presbyterian meetings, hoping that the bishops could presently be dropped as needless. Before long the Puritans had their presbyteries and classical synods all over the country, and even held one or two national synods. They issued two Ad-

monitions to Parliament, urging that the system be recognized by law and made compulsory. And with those who had seen the changes of 1535, 1550, 1558, 1560, it was not unreasonable to hope for another in 1575.

But they counted without Elizabeth, a thorough Tudor, who had no intention of seeing a clerical oligarchy govern the church. And she won over Whitgift, who even before his promotion to the bench set himself to oppose his former associates. The whole scheme was explained on behalf of the government, and the people at large, comprehending the tyranny intended by the Puritan clergy, supported the government in crushing it.

It was under these circumstances that Robert Browne became tired of waiting for the bishops or parliament to act, ashamed of cowardly ministers who shrank from their principles at the first breath of persecution. He started a reformation without tarrying for any superior authority, expounded a system free of entanglement with Canterbury or Geneva, and founded a separatist church at Norwich. He had to emigrate to the Netherlands to keep out of prison, and within six years his church broke up, while he returned to England and after other adventures forgot his principles and returned to the state church. But his action had a second time raised the standard of revolt, and braver leaders soon rallied to it.

Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury, and created new machinery to enforce uniformity. He gave the simple choice, obedience or dismissal. Five hundred clergy swallowed the leek with wry faces. But a young lawyer named Barrow, recently converted from a dissolute life, came to the rescue and exhorted them to be honest and quit the establishment. If they turned a deaf ear, the average layman was more consistent, and by 1587 we hear of several 'Anabaptist conventicles' in London and other places.

The attempt is here made to sketch the story of these: The Ancient Church of 1592, The General Baptist Church of 1612, The Mother Church of 1616, and The Southwark Mixed Church of 1621.

I.

THE FIRST, OR ANCIENT CHURCH.

In 1592 Barrow took the deliberate step of organizing a church in complete independence of the state and the legal system. If Elizabeth would not tolerate laxity within her ecclesiastical service, still less would she tolerate open mutiny. Barrow and his fellow-minister Greenwood were imprisoned, and presently executed, while the first Conventicle Act of 1593 made all such assemblies illegal. Other officers of the church had been given in custody to merchants planting a colony in the St. Lawrence river, but the vessel put back, and these men escaped to Holland where they were presently joined by most of the members. Here they split, and in 1618 one branch under Blackwell, sailed for Virginia, the first church to seek a refuge in America. The other in Amsterdam called John Canne, a Londoner, from the Fourth Church, who supported himself as a printer and book seller. In 1640 he returned via Hull and became a Baptist evangelist, well known in Bristol and London. His branch united with the English Reformed Church in 1701.

But while the Ancient Church thus threw off two branches, it still had a section in London. In 1608 we hear of five and thirty Brownists arrested. In 1616 when Henry Jacob formed the Third Church, he formally notified them of his proceeding; they were in some doubt about recognizing this, for he still kept up fellowship with parish ministers and their churches, while they were thorough Separatists. When in 1624 both their original pastors were dead and Jacob had left the Third Church, they asked Robinson, of Leyden, whether they might recognize it, and one of the last acts of that good man was to advise fellowship. The two churches were both arrested in 1632, perhaps in the same prison they learned to esteem one another fully.

After this it sinks into obscurity. It must not be confounded with the Fourth Church, which generally met in Southwark. The last glimpse of it is perhaps in 1677,

when was published "Ancient truth revived, or a true state of the ancient suffering church of Christ, commonly but falsely called Brownists, living in London and other places of this nation."

It may be noted that this church adopted the Geneva scheme of officers: One pastor, one teacher, several elders, several deacons, with a deaconess or widow. The next church we shall meet had had a leader who protested against this complex scheme, and still more against its rigidity and the demand for uniformity; he held to two orders of officers only, pastors or elders and deacons.

II.

THE SECOND, OR GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCH.

In 1612 a Second Separatist Church appeared in London, coming bodily from abroad. Its history is most remarkable. On the borders of York, Lincoln and Nottingham shires there were a few zealous clergy, such as John Smith, of Hutton Cranowick and Lincoln, Zachary Clifton, of Babworth; Richard Bernard, of Worksop. From their labors arose permanently two Separatist Churches, one at Gainsborough under Smith, one at Scrooby under Clifton. When Puritan hopes at the accession of James were dashed, and the Uniformity and Conventicle acts were rigidly enforced, these two pastors emigrated to the Netherlands with most of their flocks, though ever since the country round Crowle and Epworth has shown traces of their labors. The Scrooby Church left Clifton in Amsterdam, where he joined the exiled Ancient Church. Most of the people moved to Leyden, calling John Robinson to be pastor, ultimately settling in New England.

The Gainsborough church settled at Amsterdam, where Smith led his people into very new paths. They agreed that if the "Church of England" was no true church, her baptism was no true baptism; so Smith baptized himself—doubtless by affusion—and baptized them

on profession of their faith. There were two other influences in Amsterdam, the new stytem of Arminius, opposing the rigid Calvinism, and the old Mennonite views which Calvin had opposed. From one or both of these Smith acquired a leaning toward a humane view of predestination and free will. And when he further found that the Mennonites with whom he sympathized so much, claimed antiquity, he regretted his precipitate action and wished to unite with them. This divided his church; some held with him, and after long negotiations were admitted, though he himself died first; others returned to England under Thomas Helwys and John Morton.

Helwys, or Elwes, was of a good country family, living at Askham, near Basford, in Nottinghamshire. He had a relative in a good business in London, and another was Lieutenant of the Tower of London. So instead of returning to the country round Gainsborough, the little church followed the drift of the times and came to the capital. In two years Helwys published four tracts, emphasizing General Redemption and Free Will, and systematically expounding the views of his people, explicitly dissociating them from the Mennonite peculiarities on the Humanity of Christ, etc. Such an audacious Separatist church was too much for the authorities, who arrested some of them, and Morton had occasion to issue two pleas for toleration, one written with milk on papers smuggled out of prison. But he also found leisure to argue against the synod of Dort and John Robinson, as to predestination and baptism. His views spread, and similar congregations were formed, not only in Lincolnshire, but in Salisbury. We also hear of a secession under Elias Tookey, and have some reason to suspect that there was an earlier one, to which belonged Leonard Busher, who published the first radical plea for liberty of conscience.

This was not granted, and the position in London became very difficult. When Helwys and Morton were both dead, it was not easy to find another leader holding to believer's baptism and also to Free Will.

The other three Separatist churches whose story is here told, were then Pedobaptist and Calvinist. So several survivors of the company emigrated again, and joined their old friends from Gainsborough in the Waterlander church of Amsterdam, where the last trace of them is in 1645. The London history falls into obscurity, but if in 1643 Lamb had a flourishing church in Bell alley which could send out Henry Denne and Samuel Oates as evangelists, while Baillie knew next year of thirty-nine General Baptist Churches in London, we may reasonably expect that some of these are the lineal descendants of the Second Church, Featley being witness that for twenty years before 1644 there had been "Aanabaptists" near his place of residence.

III.

THE THIRD, OR MOTHER CHURCH.

Henry Jacob founded a third Separatist church in 1616, which has often been called the "Mother Church of the Independents." In reality it is rather the mother church of the particular Baptists. By 1646 it had divided into nine branches, of which two were in Plymouth Colony, while six in England were practising Believers' Baptism, and the seventh one adopted it. The story can be regained from Stinton's Repository, the excerpts from State papers which a study of Stinton has provoked, and printed works of Kiffen, Knowles, Cox or other members. It has been imperfectly apprehended by some students who have not noticed that more questions were at issue than merely Immersion versus Sprinkling, and that in the different branches of the church development did not proceed at the same pace.

Henry Jacob in 1584 was a Puritan clergyman who found Whitgift with a new Court of High Commission beginning to enforce conformity. He attempted in two publications to mediate between the bishops and the re-

calcitrant clergy, but found it wiser to emigrate and become chaplain to the English merchants at Middelburg, where no bishop could reach him. Here he found the original Brownist church, under Harrison, and soon showed his disapproval of Separatism by opposing the Ancient Church in Amsterdam. But the intolerance of James drove him, and the sweet reasonableness of Robinson at Leyden attracted him, so that he took one hesitating step forward. Perhaps influenced by the writings and example of Helwys, he returned to England, conferred with other Puritans, and gained their admission that he might properly start a Separatist church—but these beneficed clergy did not resign and join! He gathered some laymen with the courage of their opinions, they made mutual acknowledgment of their repentance and faith, and covenanted to walk in God's ways as they knew or should learn them. Observe that Robinson's famous exhortation was probably borrowed from this incident.

Jacob was ordained pastor, and at the wish of the church published a confession setting forth the positions they held, explaining why they dissented, and requesting toleration. James read this, but like Elizabeth, would not concede the request. After six years' trouble, Jacob resigned in despair, intending to emigrate to Virginia. After a brief interregnum, the church found another leader in John Lathrop, an ex-curate from Kent, under whom for a few years their course was peaceful.

The next trouble arose from the new doctrines of Bancroft and Laud. Richard Hooker had tried to unite reasonable men in the position that Episcopacy was allowable, and advantageous under certain circumstances; to this he did actually rally John Robinson. This was after the Puritans had upheld the Genevan system as of divine right; their extreme view provoked a reaction, and the Laudians now claimed that Episcopacy had this divine right. Against this in turn, some other extremists repudiated Episcopacy as absolutely improper, and a recruit from Colchester raised the point in this church.

With this man, Dupper by name, the difficulty was much the same as that raised twenty years earlier by Smith in Amsterdam, that baptism from parish ministers was no true baptism. The ferment he introduced spread further than he expected, but at first he only asked, who should baptize? not, who should be baptized? The matter was brought to a head when the Fourth Church persuaded them to renew their covenant, and they declined to renounce parish churches as essentially wrong. Dupper left with the thorough-going Separatists, and his subsequent history is not explored; he would have found himself quite at home with the Ancient Church.

Before this was settled, the church was raided while meeting in Blackfriars, and several members were imprisoned, including Lathrop. As he was detained, and could not minister to the church, the happy solution was found that the church should amicably divide. It possessed another able preacher, Samuel Eaton, a button-maker of St. Giles, whose sturdiness in the faith had been tested by frequent arrests. Those who preferred not only a definite covenant, but an explicit renunciation of parish churches, went with him and were joined by others. Some of these received a fresh "baptism," apparently at the hands of John Spilsbery. The best known of these men are Richard Blunt, Thomas Skippard and Mark Lucar, whose family stood well in the city, and who afterwards found his way to America.

Meantime meetings were held in the prison, to the rage of other prisoners, and the jailors were even kind enough to allow some members out to attend to their business or to go to worship. At last Lathrop was released on a promise not to attend conventicles; but he seems to have thought it allowable to gather his members for reorganization. The authorities naturally tried to arrest him again, and he escaped to Boston with some of his church. We can see the progress he had made on Jacob's position, by noting that he did not stay in the Puritan colony of Massachusetts, but crossed the border into the Separatist colony of Plymouth. Here he founded a new

church, at Scituate. But Dupper's leaven was working, and before the question became acute in England, disputes arose as to the act of baptism, whether it must be the ancient and legal immersion, or the modern Calvinistic sprinkling. So with the minority who held by Calvin, he moved nearer Plymouth to Barnstable, where he died in 1653. The church at Scituate called Chauncy, who was accustomed to immerse; and later on was honored by Dunster, who went even further. But it is melancholy to add that the Plymouth colony, which at first had influenced the Puritans toward sound Separatist views, ultimately felt the reflex influence; and when in 1686 it was amalgamated with Massachusetts, Robinson's Pilgrim Church and these two of Lathrop's both merged into the State Establishment.

Despite the migrations, there remained in England the group with Eaton, Skippard, Blunt and Lucar, and another which regarded itself as the parent stock. In 1637 this was fortunate in securing as its pastor, Henry Jessey, a Yorkshireman trained at Cambridge; but it is clear that in some way he did not suit all, for there at once began a series of departures from his church; probably his clerical professionalism was one of the stumbling blocks. On the other hand it would attract others out of the Establishment, who would approve of a real ordained clergyman.

The year 1638 proved crucial in many ways. Crosby's paraphrase in his first volume of the Stinton documents has long misled people into taking 1633 as the year when Baptists appeared, but the recovery of the Gould manuscript enables us to rectify this blunder, for which there is no authority. Kiffen tells us in his autobiography published by Ivimey that in 1638 he joined an independent congregation; this seems to be Eaton's. In the Kiffen manuscript we read that in the same year six members were dismissed on the ground that baptism was not for infants but for professed believers; they were dismissed not to Eaton but to Spilsbery. The Kiffen manuscript and the Jessey records also agree that although there was

hesitation about granting dismission, it was given at last; this shows that the point was deliberately considered no bar to communion by Jessey's church. This same year Eaton was committed for schism to Newgate, where the keeper allowed him to preach. A clergyman imprisoned for debt informed on them, alleging that Eaton "has oftentimes affirmed in his sermons that baptism was the doctrine of devils, and its original an institution from the devil." Of course Eaton had long objected to the indiscriminate baptism of all parishoners' children, but this suggests that he had gone further, and was now objecting to all baptism of infants. And in the Jessey records we read plainly that the six members dismissed were of the same mind with Eaton. He had no opportunity to take a final step, for next year he died, and the popular sympathy was shown by two hundred people attending his funeral. His church held together and grew in numbers.

By 1640 each half was strong enough to divide again. In Jessey's church was a merchant called Praisegod Barbon, selling leather at the Lock and Key in Fleet street. Half the church went with him, adopting his shop as the regular place of meeting; each half renewed its covenant and chose fresh officers. But there is no word of any change of basis. In Eaton's church matters were more advanced. Blunt had been attending to the point raised at Scituate, and had become convinced that the ancient, lawful and scriptural immersion was the only admissible baptism; while the pouring sanctioned in Edward's prayer-book, and the sprinkling imported by the Calvinists, were alike improper. Now the immersion of infants was no novelty, and in Separatist circles the "baptism" of believers was now known; but the immersion of believers was quite new in England. Apparently even Spilsbery had not yet combined these two points, for after discussion, in which most of Blunt's associates were convinced, he was sent to the Netherlands and was there baptized by a Collegiant Teacher.

Debates and journeys took time, and during 1641 that part of Eaton's church which decided for immersion—

and the rest vanish off his horizon—had divided into two. In January, 1641-2, they met together again, and on two days fifty-three people were baptized, including Thomas Kilcop, Thomas Waters, Samuel Blaiklock, Thomas Munden, Mark Lucar and Thomas Skippard. If we are surprised at missing Kiffen's name, we should remember that he too went abroad on business, and may have been baptized there; from his "Sober Discourse" published in 1681 we infer that about this time he too had become a Baptist. Both halves dispensed with a covenant, but each member had to give in his experience. This is a good instance how covenants are on the whole a mark of the Old Testament; they had so far escaped from the State Church idea, that they realized the need of a definite pledge, but had not advanced far enough to realize that God had already appointed the sign of ratification in Believer's Baptism. These people grasped the truth, and the first London Particular Baptist Church abandoned human tradition for Gods' ordinances on this point also. Some other churches combined the two, and a sketch of the various attitudes taken up by Baptists is given in Mr. Burrage's excellent work on the Church Covenant Idea.

By this time schemes were rife for reforming the State Church, and it might seem possible that they would be sufficient to check Separatism. A Root and Branch Petition was presented, and a bill drafted, but the king would go no further than disabling all men in holy orders from exercising any civil authority, on the bench, at the council board, or in Parliament. So Separation continued, and these churches throve.

Barbon came into great prominence in 1653 when Cromwell called a "Parliament" nominated by the Baptist and Congregational Churches, in which his name stood first alphabetically. The Parliament did fine work, two centuries in advance of public opinion, and the minority dissolved it by a snap vote. Next year, twenty-two of Barbon's church signed a Declaration by Baptists. He opposed the Restoration, was mobbed and imprisoned, but was released from the Tower on petition of his wife,

Sarah. In 1676 he was still in public life at the age of eighty, and when he died four years later, was buried in the Bunhill Fields cemetery.

If the facts as to his church are meager, we are better acquainted with Jessey's half. Here we find the principal figure in the next advance to be Hanserd Knowles. He was another Cambridge graduate, once a clergyman in Lincolnshire, where he had met at Gainsborough with a conventicle, perhaps a remnant of the movement once headed by John Smith. He resigned his living, renounced his ordination, and stopped preaching till he found help from one Mr. How—whom we shall meet again. Beginning preaching as a Separatist, he was so molested that he sought refuge in New England. The Bostonians were equally intolerant and drove him out, so he returned to old England at the fall of Laud, arriving in London at Christmas, 1641. For a while he kept a school, then became chaplain in the Parliamentary army, but returned to town and joined Jessey's church, which in 1642 acquiesced in Jessey restricting himself to immersion, just like Chauncy. Here in 1643 he raised a question new in this community, hesitating to have his child baptized. As Knowles was a university graduate, he formally debated the matter with Jessey in due syllogistic style. In a short time the whole church was in a commotion, and it was felt wise to call in Kiffen on the one side, and on the other a group of Pedobaptist ministers, mostly Independents. Evidently a number of points arose, including the question whether baptism might be administered by an ordained minister only, or also by any one gifted to teach and evangelize. In the end it was felt wise to solve in the old way, by amicable separation. So a new church was formed under Knowles, while other members left to join Kiffen, "as not satisfied we were baptized as a true church." Yet Jessey was shaken in his old views, and was meek enough to accept baptism from Knowles, then introduced it into his own church with a Baptist pastor, but with mixed membership. Eight years later, when Cromwell reorganized the Establishment, the pastor put

himself in a still more ambiguous position, lecturing at Allhallows and occupying the pulpit of the parish church of St. George's, Southwark. This of course was violently stopped at the restoration, and in 1663 Jessey died in jail. For the next few years all dissenting history is obscure, but in 1672 Charles issued a Declaration of Indulgence, and we find the church plucking up heart. Most of the members called to the pastorate Henry Forty. He was a strict Baptist who in 1651 had signed the third edition of the Confession, and his advent marks the conversion of the Mother Church into a regular Baptist Church. The change is doubly emphasized; the pedobaptist members drew off, and vanished when the declaration was canceled soon afterwards, and the persecution was renewed; Bunyan's church, which was and is deliberately of mixed membership, declined any longer to dismiss a member to this fellowship. Henry Forty left London in 1657 for Abingdon, but his people abode by their principles, and cast in their lot with the church of Kiffen.

This merchant divided with Hanserd Knowles, the ex-clergyman, the honor of being regarded as Baptist leaders. Despite Eaton's death, his church grew so fast when Laud's hand lost its grip, that by 1641 it seems to have divided into three groups, under Kiffen, Skippard and Munday and Blunt, Blaiklock and Kilcop. By 1643-4 they were in four groups, under Kiffen and Patience, Skippard and Munday, Webb and Kilcop, and Blunt, Emmes and Wrighters. The first three of these realized the harm done, not only in the popular mind, but in such well-meaning men as Featley and Baillie, by the confusion with the Münster Anabaptists a century earlier, and also with the numerous General Baptists who were at variance with the Calvinism now dominant; they therefore united with four other churches and published the first Particular Baptist Confession, which amazed the Puritans by its general orthodoxy, but did little toward moulding the Westminster Confession which the Puritans were then elaborating. Two years later, though the church of Blunt was breaking to pieces, the others were still of the same

mind, and had gained recruits. From Spilsbery's church Tipping had come to replace Skippard, while Kilcop had as colleague, Benjamin Cox, an Oxford ex-clergyman, supposed to be a scion of a bishop, who added a long appendix to the Confession, emphasizing predestination, lay preaching and the orderly intentions of the Particular Baptists.

Kiffen's business abilities enabled him to amass a large fortune, so that he built a meeting-house in Devonshire Square. As churches usually met only once a week, though for a long session, this house was not only used for his own congregation, but was lent to other Baptist churches at various times on Saturday and Sunday; inattention to this fact has led historians into some confusion between perfectly distinct organizations. In 1675 Kiffen's church was strengthened by the accession of the Mother Church once under Jessey, doubtless bringing with them some manuscript records. Kiffen's absences from London on business obliged him to have helpers in his ministry; it is somewhat curious that both of them have been confused with other men of the same name, who were not Baptists. Daniel Dike was an ex-clergyman from Cambridge; but by 1690 such men were hard to find, as the universities had been closed to Baptists for a generation. Tombes of Bendley had, however, trained a few men for the ministry, and one of these, Richard Adams, after a varied career in Leicestershire was now pastor of a Baptist church in Southwark. He was invited, and worthily upheld the place, so when Kiffen closed a long and honored life in1701, he became chief pastor, though he soon obtained the help of Mark Key and John Toms. Before his death in 1716 he handed over some papers of Jessey and Kiffen to Stinton, of Southwark. On the death of Key in 1726 the church decided to disband, and hand over the meeting-house to another old church, which had an endowment, but was at the time homeless. And in this humiliating way one of the earliest London Baptist churches committed suicide!

The members indeed joined the newcomers, who in-

herited all the documents and continued the use of Kiffen's church-book; but the present "Devonshire Square" church, now meeting three miles north in Stoke Newington, is not the 1638 church of Eaton and Kiffen. It has an honorable history of its own, though owing to a division, some of its documents went into the hands of a section which lapsed into Unitarianism and became extinct. While a little uncertainty rests on it between 1646 and 1676, its story appears to be as follows:

Benjamin Cox and Thomas Kilcop presided in 1646 over the branch of the Mother Church which separated in 1633. Five years later it would seem that Edward Harrison succeeded them, another ex-clergyman; and under him it well maintained a leading position, keeping in close touch with Kiffen's church. Dying about 1673, he was succeeded by William Collins and Nehemiah Cox, son of Benjamin, and by 1676 we find a strong church meeting at a spacious building in Petty, France. Next year Collins issued a confession of faith, modeled on the Westminster Confession; in the bitter persecution it was no time to emphasize differences, and Baptists were ready to show their large agreement with their brother Presbyterians. A catechism followed in due time, and in 1689 a great assembly of 105 Particular Baptist Churches approved Collins' Confession, which ever since has enjoyed much reputation. Cox dying that year, a son of Edward Harrison was chosen to succeed him, but when a dispute arose as to the advisability of congregational singing, he left with some of the members. Collins also removed to Artillery Lane, but on his death the dispute was renewed, and the opponents of singing went off to Wallbroog and then to Turner's Hall. Here they continued under Ebenezer Wilson from Bristol, Thomas Dewhurst from Yorkshire, and Sayer Rudd from Southwark; till in 1727 they were invited to take possession of Devonshire Square.

The ninth branch of Jacob's prolific stem is the church under Hanserd Knowles. As often occurred with ex-clergymen, he himself was led into strange ways; he took

office in Cromwell's Establishment as rector of Scartho, nor does it palliate this offense that he never set foot in the parish. His church was clearer-sighted, and joined with Barbon, Jessey and others in objecting to the state commision of Tryers for the ministry. After the restoration the church was troubled like all others; but it developed presently; entertained a great Assembly of Particular Baptists from all over the kingdom early in Williams' reign, and became known as the celebrated Cripplegate meeting, where John Brine led the hyper-Calvinists.

Summing up then the work of Jacob after only thirty years, we find the little one had become nine:

First—The Mother Church, under Jessey, mixed membership;

Second—The 1633 church, under Cox and Kilcop, Baptist;

Third—The 1634 church at Scituate, under Chauncy, Pedobaptist but immersing;

Fourth—The 1639 church at Barnstable, under Lathrop, Pedobaptist and sprinkling;

Fifth—The 1640 church, under Barbon, rapidly adopting Baptist views;

Sixth—The 1641 church, under Munden and Tipping, Baptist;

Seventh—The 1641 church, under Kiffen and Patient, Baptist;

Eighth—The 1642 church, under Blunt, Baptist, about to collapse;

Ninth—The 1643 church, under Knowles and Holms, Baptist.

IV.

THE FOURTH OR MIXED CHURCH.

To Stinton we are indebted for the records of another church which has been misunderstood from the days of Neal onward, nor did Crosby quite complete its story. Indeed a lack of dates is the great weakness of "old Mr.

Webb'' or whoever penned the account which Stinton copied and annotated.

An ex-clergyman named Hubberd founded it about 1621. After a brief exile in Ireland, John Canne succeeded Hubberd, beginning a line of pastors who like Paul supported themselves. Apparently he stayed till about 1630 when he persuaded the Third Church to renew its covenant, and recognized it on that condition. This does not agree with the usual version, which, however, crowds too much into two years. It is possible that Canne began his printing business in Amsterdam before this, and traveled backwards and forwards. Certainly by 1632 he had landed in Amsterdam with other members, was preaching on the reconciliation of two estranged communities, and was soon pastor of the exiled Ancient Church there. The Fourth Church called Samuel How, who in 1632 was a member of the Third Church and was arrested at one of its meetings. He was popularly known as the Learned Cobbler, and objected on principle to a professional ministry trained at the universities, publishing a book on the Sufficiency of the Spirit's Teaching. He revived this church, causing it to renew its covenant. Of course under Laud they had no regular place of meeting; fields and woods served them, and once they hired the Nag's Head tavern, near Coleman street. This street was a great center for Separatists, and had at least one meeting-house in it, which was occasionally used by How. After a seven years' ministry, he died in 1640, worn out with persecution, and was denied burial in consecrated ground. This was evidently felt to be a grievance by his church, whereas Eaton's friends defiantly refused to employ the official service at his death, a year earlier.

Next January the church was meeting at the house of a member in Deadman's place, Southwark, when they were arrested under the Conventicle Act; it was alleged that they openly defied and threatened the officers, for Laud was now in prison. Appeal was made to the king, who passed the matter on to the House of Lords. The House made a proclamation that public worship was not

to be disturbed, and bade the clergy perform service according to law— rather a hit at the Laudian ritualists, and perhaps at the great Featley. Next day a few peers came to see for themselves and heard a sermon on Matthew xxviii, 18-20, dwelling on the church possessing the power of Christ which he delegated to them. Lord Brooke was so impressed that he wrote a clumsy plea for toleration, which inspired Milton to his great Areopagitica. Six of the members were brought in, but denied the truth of the accusation. The House let them off with an order to attend the parish churches, but did not expressly say that conventicles were unlawful; and in fact they were not further molested.

Now the Lords' Journals call them only Sectaries, while Fuller speaks of the affair as Anabaptistical insolence. The fact is that the church had not taken any united stand on the subject of Believers' Baptism. Its former pastor, Canne, was now a mixed-communion Baptist, Samuel How is said to have become a Baptist, but not so Stephen More the deacon, a well-to-do packer of stuffs in Philpot Lane. Now that text in Matthew dealt with more matters than the authority of Christ in general, and soon after More was chosen pastor, "schism broke out," as the narrator politely puts it. The fact is that two of the six members brought before the House of Lords, John Webb and Thomas Gunn, preferred a less ambiguous position on the matter of baptism. Webb left and replaced Samuel Blaiklock as Kilcop's colleague in the second branch of the Third Church, Thomas Gunn finding a helper in John Mabbatt, and founding a new church; both united in signing the great Confession of 1644.

So in 1648 the Fourth Church renewed its covenant, and this time to have deliberately adopted mixed-communion, if we may argue back from the time and language of the narrator. In Cromwell's time the church had peace and prosperity, and at one time was so much in favor that it met in Whitehall and St. James. In 1662 it was driven into obscurity, but obtained recruits all through the time of persecution, including the narrator, a countryman called

Webb, not apparently related to John Webb the Baptist.

More died in the Marshalsea about 1685, and they managed without any pastor for some twelve years, meeting near St. Mary Overy's in Southwark. Then a Baptist church in White street, split on the question of mixed membership, and Richard Robbins, the pastor, with the other lax members, united with this Fourth Church. But he was ambitious and rather professional—we meet him in touch with Kesch and Adams—which was contrary to the principles of this church, for whom he was too expensive. So in 1699 he went off with forty members to another mixed membership church in Whitechapel. After one more pastor, Valentine Lindsey, the church disbanded in 1705, the members joining other churches. Mixed membership churches seem to have had a way of disbanding or of taking up a decided position as to baptism. The documents came into the hands of Stinton, thence to Crosby; he lent them to Neal, who misused them and set many later students on a wrong track.

Stinton's Repository has thus afforded the means of outlining the history of four early churches with their subdivisions; nor is its value in this respect quite exhausted. One ambiguous sentence in the Kiffen manuscript was misunderstood by Crosby in his first volume, and has misled very many writers who have not noticed his accurate transcript in the third volume.

In 1639, when the power of the bishops was waning, a conventicle was opened in Crutched Friars by a feltmaker called Green, and a coachman named John Spenser. When the Puritan clergy objected, Spenser published in 1641 a short treaties on the lawfulness of every man exercising his gift as God shall call unto. Among their congregation was Paul Hobson, who with Spenser accepted commissions in the Parliamentary army. But whereas, Green and Spenser were Brownists or Independents, and remained so, as far as we can tell, Hobson was more logical and became Baptist. So he severed connection with them, and joined forces with Thomas Gower, another officer. Their Baptist church signed the Confession

in 1644 and 1646. When they went on active service, they founded other churches, at Newport, Pagnell and at Newcastle. But the London church is not easily traceable further.

Another church appears under John Spilsbery in 1638, to which Jessey says he dismissed six members who objected to infant baptism. It has been customary to say that this was a branch of Jacob's church, on the authority of Crosby; but the Stinton Repository affords no proof of this, nor does Crosby allege any other authority; the question remains open. Nor is it likely that in 1638 Spilsbery had restricted himself to immersion; he may have practiced it, but as yet there is no evidence that it was the sole method; while Blunt's action in going abroad to obtain immersion, strongly suggests that Spilsbery was not regarded as a duly-qualified administrator.

By 1644 he had swung into line, and signed the Confession, with Tipping and Richardson. This latter man had the courage to oppose the notorious and scurrilous Daniel Featley, after the Presbyterian had published his version of his debate with Kiffen; and presently to petition the intolerant Presbyterian parliament for liberty of conscience. By 1646 Tipping had left to join Munden, Skippard disappearing. By 1651 Richardson had parted company with Spilsbery; he strongly supported Cromwell, and in 1656 published a manifesto against the fifth-monarchy anarchists, thanking Cromwell for religious liberty. Spilsbery did not differ in principle for he too in 1662 signed a declaration against the fifth-monarchy men.

He was succeeded by John Norcott, and at his death early in 1676 we find the church owning a meeting-house in Old Gravel Lane, Broad street, Wapping, where Kesch preached the funeral sermon. The after history is well known. At Prescot street the church had such famous ministers as Samuel Wilson and Abraham Booth. In the eighteenth century it was a leading church, and one of its members was a great benefactor of the college now at Regent's Park, where the Gould manuscript has an appropriate home.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE GOULD MANUSCRIPT.

The book is an ordinary foolscap ledger, thirty lines to the page, written on the right hand pages only. The book is not half full, 138 pages being occupied with the thirty numbered extracts, compiled by Stinton, eighteen with memoranda by Crosby, forty-four with the records of the Barkshire Association, and one with the note on Turner.

The first page was written not by Keymer, but by Gould of Norwich, and several exceptional spellings are underlined by him, evidently as a model or a warning for Keymer to copy most scrupulously every error in the original however obvious. For instance: Antipedobaptists Independant, Cheif, haveing, farr, 4 Assertion (with a line indicating the absence of the s) famious Comandement. That Keymer paid the necessary attention may easily be verified when we remembr that many of these extracts were made by Stinton from printed books and Keymer's transcript of Stinton can be compared with the printed originals. Of course an occasional slip was made, but the general accuracy is surprising. The last page also was written by Gould; the first line contains a strange blunder which he was not likely to make, but which he would faithfully reproduce if he found it in his exemplar. Probably this was the last addition made by Crosby; the owner and projector of the transcript may have seen the fitness of closing the whole copy, as he began it, with an autograph page.

In case doubt still lingers in any mind that the thirty numbered articles, constituting the Repository proper, were brought together by Stinton, four further points are adduced which the writer had noted some time ago, in addition to the main proofs offered by Mr. Burrage:

The Repository is concerned entirely with London, except for the Aylesbury documents brought to London by Keach. Stinton was a Londoner, and married Keach's daughter.

The headings of the separate documents are not de-

cent English, and are punctuated badly. Stinton had received no academic training, and in a literary age published very little.

A document gives an outline history of a church which on one occasion met at a private house in Deadman's place, Southwark, but which became extinct in 1705. This church, to the indignation of Crosby, a Southwark man, has often been confused with the Independent church habitually meeting in that street which only died in his time. Stinton was concerned with Adams and Key in baptizing Jonathan Owen, pastor of that Independent church, and was buried in the ground adjoining.

Several documents of this collection relate to the old General Baptists, and others to the foreign Anabaptists, without betraying any consciousness of the great difference of these two bodies from each other, and from the Particular Baptists. Crosby also has effaced all distinction in his history, which is thereby highly confused. Now Stinton strongly objected to limiting the Particular Baptist Fund, and excluding the General Baptist; and Crosby was his deacon.

But if Stinton compiled the numbered documents, Crosby added apparently all the others now copied in the Gould manuscript. Miller's letter of January, 1737-8, to Randall, one of these appended pieces, was used by him in his 1740 volume. The next piece relats to "Persecution for Religion" of which he had already written in the first volume, published 1738; as the language differs greatly, it seems fair to infer that this memorandum was made after the publication. The records of the Berks Association follow.— These are exciting great interest in the county since the writer sent a copy early last year; the existence of the association had been forgotten, and a local minister prompted by their recovery is now preparing a stort history of 250 years. Mr. Burrage traces these to another book, which bears the inscription, "Jos. Stennett, 1747;" from which we can reconstruct the situation. At that time two Joseph Stennetts were living, the pastor of Little Wild Street in London, who occa-

sionally preached at Crosby's church; and his son, pastor of Coate, one of the churches in this group, associated with the pastor of Abingdon who had just come from Crosby's church. Father and son had a love of history in them, for the father's father, himself called Joseph, a London pastor friendly with Richard Adams, had made some collection of materials, had copied out the records of an old church, and had been asked to compile a full history, from which he was hindered by death in 1713. Perhaps he made this very collection, which only extends to 1708. Now it seems as if Crosby borrowed it from the father or the son, who took the precaution of writing his name and date in it. Thus we get the date when Crosby practically closed his additions to Stinton's Repository, 1747. It is interesting that the original should have come into the possession of Gould. We know that when he was at Norwich in 1857 he was accumulating all sorts of historical material bearing on Baptist antiquities, and was in touch with the pastor of Wild Street.

Going behind Crosby, Stinton and Adams, we arrive at four documents which have been used in this article: 1, the Jessey Records; 2, the Kiffen manuscript; 4, the Knowles Debate; and 23, the Southwark Story. The credibility of the first three has been impeached, and although it has been well defended by Dr. Lofton, a word or two may be added. Adams was minister at Devonshire Square, over a church which was a reunion of two branches of the Third or Mother Church, once under Jessey and Kiffen respectively. He gave these documents to Stinton, who attributes (1) and (4) to Jessey, the familiar Mr. H. Jessey, not W. A. Jessey, which latter is a false reading—while Crosby attributes (2) to Kiffen. The only reasonable doubt arises in the case of (1), which is in a rather muddled state. Apparently Stinton had before him four distinct papers, which he copied consecutively, adding dates in the right margin, and noting at the end that there were also sheets of names which he did not reproduce. The four papers

were, (a) a fairly consecutive set of notes about the years 1624 to 1634, evidently written not later than 1641, for near the end it is said that some of the saints were still held to bail; (b) another set of notes covering 1620-1638; (c) a third set covering 1636-1641; (d) a note to the renewal of the covenant in 1630. The stolid Stinton copied his material and did not try to work it into one consecutive story. Some memoranda are barely intelligible, but the keenest fair criticism only raises doubts whether the writer were well informed as to all the books written by Henry Jacob, and the end of his career, after leaving the church; and fortunately this is immaterial to the main story. For the rest, nothing appears incredible, and if the statements tally so well with state papers of the period and books printed then, we may believe them, and the tradition of their authorship. A higher critic who would any longer discredit them and their story, would work awful havoc if he turned his attention to suspect and disintegrate the Bible.

WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY?

BY PROF. WILLIAM NEWTON CLARKE, D.D.

I do not propose to rehearse the answers that have been given to this great question, or to argue out what the answer should be, but rather to present the answer that seems to me the true one. Even if I should not altogther use familiar phrases, I trust that the meaning may be plain.

There are various lights in which Christianity may be regarded, various offices that it fills. Sometimes we think of it in view of one of these, sometimes of another, and so we often find the name ambiguous; but if we succeed in finding the essence of Christianity it will be something that accounts for them all. I call to mind three of these differing aspects of our religion.

(1) Christianity is a work of salvation, or recovery for the sinful. It is a work of love in the interest of holiness; it is wholly ethical in its quality and aim; it brings to bear upon sin the entire force of God's opposition, with intent to deliver men from its power. Expressing God's love for the sinful, it contains the actual wielding of his spiritual might in their behalf, to the end that they may be transformed from sin to holiness. The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation, as we see in the fact that here God actually saves. Herein is the practical quality in Christianity; it brings to pass that which ought to be.

(2) Christianity is a revelation, a manifestation of eternal reality. It is a revelation from God, and of God, by means of which we know God as he is, in the character and relations in which men most need to know him. In revealing God it reveals religion as it ought to be, for it shows the right relation between God and men, the right fulfillment of which is religion at its best. Christianity

makes eternal reality known, and thus reveals man, life, duty, privilege, destiny, all in the true light. Herein is the absoluteness and finality of Christianity; it makes known that which is.

(3) Christianity is a life corresponding to the recovery and the revelation. It is a life in which men, by divine renewal and inspiration, have begun to live as men recovered and delivered, after the likeness of the God who is revealed. It is the right life, lived in the character that men ought to bear. It is morally sound and spiritually uplifting; and as God himself has been revealed in a work of usefulness, or recovery, so this life is not self-contained, but goes forth to impart a divine gift of blessing to the world. It is enthusiastically on the side of all that is good among men, and it eagerly offers men all the good it can do them. Herein is the beauty and power of Christianity; it reproduces in men the activity of the holiness and love of God.

Our inquiry for the essence of Christianity amounts to an inquiry whether it is possible to find one heart and substance for all these meanings. What is it that these various aspects of the one faith and life express? Can we answer this question? Yes. It is possible to gather all these meanings up into a single expression. There is one symbol for them all, and for all that is essential and distinctive in the religion that we call by the name of Jesus Christ.

It is no new symbol, invented or discovered by modern thought. It has been familiar for ages. It is as old in use as the church of the Catacombs, perhaps older. The early Christians followed a true spiritual instinct when they selected an emblem for their religion, and passed it on to their successors. The new faith sprang from Jesus Christ, but they did not choose a portrait of him for their symbol, nor did they select some saying of his, however, characteristic and divine. The crucifix, or the cross with the dying Christ upon it, a symbol dear to many who have borne his name, was not their choice. They chose the cross, simply the bare cross, as the symbol that should

express their faith and describe their religion. They chose wisely. The cross is the symbol of Christianity, and that which the cross expresses is the essence of Christianity.

What then does the cross mean? It has been interpreted in many ways, and discussion about its meaning has often run high, and yet deeper than all difference has been the unity of Christian faith and love in discerning its significance. To all it has been essentially the same. However divergent their forms of doctrine, Christians have felt and known in common that the cross is the symbol of service, sacrifice, the love-work of one for another. Alike in all doctrines of its efficacy, it is the sign of burden-bearing love—of burden-bearing love that stands for holiness and knows no joy like that of delivering men from evil. So the cross stands for holy, redemptive, self-sacrificing love, eager to save. And the cross is the symbol of Christianity; which means that holy, redemptive, self-sacrificing love, eager to save, is the essence of Christianity.

This meaning in the cross is that one heart and substance which we are seeking for the various meanings of our religion. It is this that constitutes the divine significance in Christianity as a salvation, Christianity as a revelation, and Christianity as a life.

(1) That Christianity as a work of salvation is a work of holy, redemptive, self-sacrificing love, needs but little comment here, for all who know Christ at all know the spirit in which he loved and died. This is that in which all Christians are one; they testify that he bore our sins in the will to save. He was the supreme expression in this world of the love-passion that will save at any cost. The weight of our burden fell upon him and was joyfully accepted. He was the burden-bearer who wrought in that self-forgetfulness of love which is the spirit of salvation. By the service and sacrifice of one in behalf of others Jesus Christ became Savior of the world. This is what Christianity affirms, that by this supreme action of vicarious service the divine will to save became effective.

Thus Christianity has at its heart a pure and holy redeeming love, utterly opposed to evil in every form, devoted to the producing of every good, and full of the divine joy of a redeeming purpose. Around this common center all theories of Christ's redeeming work have gathered, and there is no one of them that does not give sincere expression to this essential truth of Christianity. This is no news; every one knows that the cross, thus interpreted, is the true sign of the redeeming significance of Jesus Christ, and that Christianity is the religion of that significance.

(2) But the cross is more than the implement of a work; it is the instrument of a revelation. Does it tell how the love-passion mastered Jesus and made him Savior? Yes, but in telling that it tells more. Jesus is not merely himself; he does the will of the Father, and lives and dies revealing God. Christianity has learned that what Christ is, God is, and that the love-passion of Jesus is the love-passion of God. Accordingly it affirms that God is love, and such love as the cross expresses, and proclaims the cross as the true symbol of God. It was God that so loved the world; hence it was from the heart of God that the redemption proceeded and the cross of Christ came forth. The Christian revelation declares that one who would know God aright must see him in this symbol; his is the holiness, his the love, his the self-forgetful passion for saving. All this has place in his essential character and eternal being. In the cross he is truly revealed, as the God who so loves holiness and men that he will endure and endeavor to the uttermost in order that men and holiness may come together. We know the Christ of the cross, and the Christ of the cross reveals to us the God of the cross, who himself bears our sins in his eternal heart of holiness and love. This is the revelation of Christianity, that the righteous and holy God who hates all sin is also Savior, a God whose hatred of sin shines forth supremely in his desire and endeavor to put it away. It shows enthroned in the living God all the holy love-passion and self-sacrifice before which

broken hearts have bowed at the cross of Jesus. One who has learned the revelation of Christianity beholds God thus.

(3) The cross which is the implement of a work and the instrument of a revelation is also the inspiration of a life; and the life in which Christianity is embodied is aglow with that love-passion for holy service which the cross expresses. The Christian revelation of God is also a revelation of the right character and life for men, for men ought to be like God. It is no less a revelation of the right character of religion, for religion is the right relation between God and men. And the cross, since it is the center of a work of salvation and recovery from evil, is the means of initiating in men a new life of right religion in fellowship with God. Through the redeeming work of Christ there come to be Christians in the world; and what a Christian is we learn from Christ and from Christianity. To be a Christian is to be animated by that spirit of Christ and of God which is the spirit of the cross; it is to be intensely and enthusiastically on the side of all good and against all evil; it is to be possessed by the divine love-passion for men; it is to forget and sacrifice one's self in bearing the burdens of those whom one can help. A Christian is one who like Christ and like God loves men, lives for them and bears their burdens, giving himself in order to bring them out of evil into good. And Christianity, since it is a power unto salvation, has and must have its people. In the fellowship of faith with Christ, this new life is brought into existence, and Christian souls are born. The Christian people are comrades of the cross, the company of holy and helpful men, who live not unto themselves, but for the redemptive purpose of God in Christ.

In this one spirit Christianity has its heart and substance. If we call it a religion, we see what kind of religion it is. It is a doctrine of God, of Christ and of man, and the three doctrines are one. It presents the cross as the true symbol of God, of Christ, and of the human being. It thus reveals a great and noble unity, extending

from the Highest through Christ down to us and our poor life—a unity of holy saving love that acknowledges no barrier in the way of its self-sacrificing endeavor to do good. And evidently Christianity is first a life, not merely a doctrine or theory of things. It is a life within this divine-human unity. It is a life eternal in God, revealed in Christ, produced in us. It is a love eternal in God, effective in Christ for our salvation, and awakened in us, to be the daily and everlasting motive power of our being.

This definition of the essence of Christianity might be lighted up by illustration from Christian history. From that source indeed it may be proved correct. It is true that the history of Christianity shows imperfection at every stage, but it is the imperfect history of just such a power as has now been described. It is the history of a power that consists in love divine and human, working against evil by free self-sacrifice. This is a true description of Christianity in the world, however imperfect it may have been. Purity and unselfishness are just the qualities that shine forth in splendor in the early Christian life, making all things new; for Christianity was sweeter and purer far than the world around it, just because it was animated by an unspeakable tenderness of unselfish love, eager to be useful. Early Christianity was imperfect, but it was an imperfect imitation of Christ; it was incomplete, but it was an incomplete reproduction of the spirit of the cross. In so far as Christianity in succeeding ages has been true to its own type, it has always been full of purity and love, of holiness and help, of goodness and salvation, grounded in the revelation of God and the saving work of Christ. The essence of the historical Christianity is identical with that essential spirit of the cross which we find in the original Christianity, in Christ and in God.

The definition is confirmed no less by what we know of the strength and weakness of the current Christianity of the present day. That the weakness of our every-day religion lies here, we cannot doubt. The defects of the

current Christianity are defects in respect of these very qualities—purity, unselfishness, and the consciousness that the whole is grounded in divine reality. Let there now be breathed into living Christians the love of holiness and hatred of sin which the cross expresses, and the self-forgetful love of which the cross is the symbol, with living sense of the connection of all with God in Christ, and the weakness of Christianity will be past, and the day of power will have come. It is for the lack of the spirit of the cross that our modern Christianity is weak, and we run into works unworthy of our name and calling. On the other hand, it is when ardent love of goodness and self-sacrificing love for men go forth to action, impelled by sense of fellowship with the eternal life and love of God, that Christianity is itself and makes its mark upon the world. Our inmost heart and conscience, whether in penitence or in aspiration, defines the essence of Christianity just as it is here defined, as the spirit of the cross; and the judgment both of the church and of the world confirms the definition.

Under this definition we can well recognize the ideal of working Christianity, and imagine what a real Christian people would be. A people fully Christian would be joyful. The cross is associated with suffering, and the mention of it may bring sorrow to mind, but the spirit of the cross is the spirit of One who for the joy of Saviorhood that was set before him endured the suffering and despised the shame. The people of the cross will be joyful, because the whole impulse that makes them what they are is divine, and is grounded in the glorious reality of the being and character of God, revealed and brought near in Christ. They will be a glad and free-hearted people because they are a people of the eternal, who take the type of character and life not from passing things but from eternal realities. Because of this fellowship with a God who is holy, they will be a holy people; and because of this fellowship with a God who is love, they will be a people outreaching to all usefulness. Nothing that is human will be foreign to them, and noth-

ing will be foreign to them that is good. They will be helpers of mankind in every way, eager in all good and useful works, devoted to the betterment of the common lot in all possible respects. They will be consecrated to the promotion of all high ethical aims; and surely a gospel of salvation from sin will be the strongest of all reformatory forces, and inspire them to the support of every useful enterprise that man can conceive. So they will be in every sense of the word a saving people; most of all in the sense that is deepest and highest--a people devoted to the bringing of men out of their sinful heart and life into living fellowship with God. And the crowning and ever-present characteristic is that they will be a people not of theory but of practice, not of ideas alone but of life. The cross was the chariot of action and of victory, and the spirit of the cross is the spirit that will do the works of the cross in redemption. They will be companions of the Savior, workers together with God.

The definition of Christianity implies the definition of a Christian, and a true picture of what it is to be saved. We are always told that to be saved is to be so wrought upon by divine grace in Christ as to be delivered from sin and transformed into the likness of him who saves us. This is exactly right, only it may need further defining. The sin from which we are to be saved is of many kinds, but at the heart it is the evil of selfishness and moral indifference—of indifference to sin and the harm it works, and unhelpfulness toward men. To be saved is to be delivered from the indwelling evil that prevents one from being in his own degree a savior together with Christ; it is to be so made new as to be actuated now by the spirit of the cross, and led to bear lovingly the burdens that bear men down to destruction. It is not merely to be taken care of by divine grace, and carried to heaven, safe in the arms of Jesus; it is to become a follower of Jesus in the way that he went, a soul that will do the works of love and help in free self-sacrifice, that it may be well with others.

Do we ask how many Christians there are, and whether

we are Christians? The definition is sharp and searching. Whether we are Christians or not is to be judged in part by those who know us and are able to estimate our attitude toward the world for which our Master chose to die; partly also it is to be judged by ourselves, from inward knowledge not merely of our joys and hopes but of our motives and our ruling choice. Certain it is that if we are to be Christians in the true and worthy sense we must be loyal comrades of the cross, for the cross is the essence of Christianity.

3/24/06.

THE BAPTIST WORLD CONGRESS—A STUDY.

BY W. O. CARVER, TH. D., PROFESSOR IN THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The Baptist World Congress, held in London, July 11-18, 1905, has, in the current phrase, passed into history. The somewhat bulky and well-executed volume recording its proceedings is in our hands and easily accessible. The Congress has been extensively reported, praised, discussed and criticised in the religious press, especially the Baptist weeklies. Many have written wisely and well and to such writers any intelligent student of the Congress must now give extensive credit for any views he may hold or criticisms he may express. By this time the weaknesses and faults of the Congress have been detected and displayed to the utmost; for no great undertaking or significant achievement was ever wanting critics and detractors, and the more so in proportion as it projects itself significantly into the future where it is to prove a factor in the forms and extent of human development. It may be pardonable, therefore, if one shall give permanent form and dignity to a study of this Congress designed to summarize some features of its significance.

I. HISTORY.

How the Congress came to be it is aside from our purpose to detail and for the programme, personnel, and popular features we must refer to the official reports. Such a meeting could not be the mechanical product of any man. It was the product of a sentiment, the outcome of a spiritual preparation. Suggestions had been made before which, while they bore no immediate fruit, were seed that sprang up and grew while men slept. Other international religious meetings, different in

scope and type, had cultivated the sense of possibility of such a meeting. The spirit of the times for some years was characterized by a wide spirit of federation. The idea of unity was in solution in the Baptist consciousness. The persecution of English Baptists, along with other Independents, under the education act, attracted universal attention; and the sympathetic fires were fed, also, by persecution elsewhere, notably in Russia. It only remained for the idea in solution to be precipitated in concrete crystalization. The *Baptist Argus* had been building up a world-wide band of readers, with only vague ideas of the uses which such a constituency might serve for the Kingdom of God. At the "psychological moment" this paper made the suggestion and discreetly pushed it until the response was imperative. The invitation was made by the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland which put the consummation in the hands of a committee which won the admiration and appreciation of a universal brotherhood for its successful skill.

The programme was wrought out by the collaboration of British and American committees, with the final authority in the British committee. There was a caution to avoid subjects possibly lending themselves to friction or controversy, which was wise, but which will be less necessary in the future. The programme may be criticised somewhat also as lacking in constructive unity. It is well to know, however, that the defects were little felt in the meetings and the scope of discussion was ample, including as it did, Baptist principles and obligation, theological and general education, social aspects of Christianity and missionary principles and problems.

The speakers were conscious of the opportunity and responsibility of their appointment. There were not more than two or three poor addresses and the only serious breaches were in one or two brief *ex tempore* addresses— a truly remarkable record.

The attendance was remarkable alike for numbers, approximating four thousand, and for its national universality. Pentecost was the illustration which alone met

the demand for describing the diversity and number of countries represented.

It is not easy adequately to characterize the spirit of the Congress. There was a magnificence and grandeur about it that was a constant surprise to the meeting itself; not productive of haughtiness or over self-confidence but inspiring and exalting.

The social feature of the meeting was very marked, both in the cordiality and completeness of the reception and entertainment accorded the visitors by London Baptists and other Christians whether officially or socially, and in the delight in social fellowship between men from various lands.

But it is of the religious spirit we would especially speak. In general this may be well summed up in the two points of Dr. Maclaren's address of welcome and the two points of Dr. Strong's "Congress Sermon." In the simple, great address there was persuasive emphasis upon the proper religious ideals summed up in the phrases, "In the Name of Christ," "By the Power of the Spirit." The sermon set forth the sum of Christian duty and opportunity in the two commands, "Know Christ," "Make Christ Known."

We may articulate the dominant notes of the Congress, in such principles as found both most emphasis in the addresses and most hearty response in the audiences.

1. Here the first thing to be named is *loyalty to Jesus Christ.* This was most universally accentuated by the speakers with clearness and reverent conviction and met the deepest and most enthusistic response in the audiences. It was at the foundation of the discussion of every topic and determinant of every attitude that found general approval in the Congress. The divine Savior was the Lord of loyal hearts. It was declared that no statement of principles could be approved in the Congress that did not speak unequivocally for the deity of Jesus Christ and loyalty to his idea of the ordinance of baptism.

2. Another note of primary emphasis was *in-*

dividualism in religion. Man stands essentially and inalienably face to face with God, and no man nor institution must intervene. "Every man shall give account of himself to God." This every man must do and must be permitted to do. Every phase of hindrance to this primary truth was condemned.

3. Out of this last grows at once the contention for "*a free church in a free State.*" The local situation in England served to emphasize this Baptist fundamental and to reveal the incompleteness of its recognition in many quarters in all the lands.

4. *Brotherly love* was in free flow and found varied expression. So much was this time that most of these who attended the meetings are unable to sympathize with, or well understand the causes for disagreement and the occasions for slight fellowship so vigorously urged by a few brethren who were not in attendance. Whatever occasions for misgivings and suspicion any may have felt were for the time, surely, swallowed up in the brotherhood of love to a common Master. There was not disloyalty to conviction , nor surrender of opinion, not even of well-grounded prejudice, mayhap, but the "bond of perfectness" made at least temporary unity.

5. There was also manifest enough a sense of *Baptist opportunity effectively to deliver the Baptist message* to the world and so to justify our denominational existence. Such may serve as a summary of the intellectual and religious marks of the meetings.

II. SIGNIFICANCE.

Such a meeting must have real and large meaning or be condemned as abortive. We have seen that it could only be a product of a genuine and wide interest looking toward some end more or less defined. The meeting itself must further define its idea and determine its end. The Congress has a meaning for the Baptist denomination within itself. It tends to heighten its self-consciousness and so to disclose its functions, its task and its equipment.

There is also a meaning for the denomination in its relation to the Christian world and furtheer to the world as a whole. We inquire, then; What is the outcome in ideas and ideals? It will remain to ask, finally, of the practical outcome which lies in the future.

1. If in other respects our denomination shall prove worthy, it is of great significance that there has come about an uncovering of the Baptist body and position. The body has become conscious of itself and has made the world conscious of it in its proportions and contentions to a degree bitherto unknown.

The rise of the Baptists in modern history has been more rapid and real than could be appreciated. In numbers, intellectual life, social influence and political impress the Baptists have advanced steadily but rapidly. This advance has not been attended by the blazing fervor of evangelistic enthusiasm of the Methodists, nor the bizarre attractions of the Salvation Army. For the most part our impress on the other people has been quiet and pervasive and to a degree permeating, as will be increasingly manifest hereafter. Our missionary primacy served to set other Protestants at this divine task but not continuously to attract attention to ourselves. Our principle of individualism, expressing iself in our polity of local church autonomy, combining with the practical division of our forces in organizations for more general enterprises, left no sufficient opportunity or occasion for taking stock of ourselves.

But the time was ripe for union of forces and when we came together we surprised first ourselves, then the Christian community, then the world at our numbers and distribution. On the principle by which such religious statistics are usually compiled it was found that the world holds a population of 20,000,000 of Baptists, while the actual communicants overtop 6,000,000. Here are facts that call for attention. Baptists are no longer either despised, or obscure, or insignificant. This they know themselves and the world will know with interest. The London daily press, little given to religious affairs, turns

aside to give to the Baptist Congress attention and space accorded to no other religious meeting of similar duration unless it be a meeting of the Church of England at which state issues are prominent.

2. But as these Baptists really one people? Are they not rather several "churches" only related and not to be identified? The *sense of unity* realized in this Congress pronounces a distinct negative to this last question. With somewhat varying accent and somewhat dissimilar emphasis we have found ourselves speaking the same denominational language. We have our provincialisms but are one religious race. And our coming together has so exalted into prominence the fundamentals which all agree in owning and supporting that the minor and provincial nature of our divergencies has become apparent. It is of immense value in many ways thus to see ourselves and be seen of men as one, for so shall Christ be glorified in us.

3. Unity in action spells *fraternity.* We look one another in the face, and in the heart, and we love. There is realized *the brotherhood of faith.* We now know as truly as before, that we differ, in some respects widely it may be; but we know also why we differ, and no longer guess; and knowing why, we better understand and tolerate. We shall soon cease to tolerate, because we shall have learned to respect, the differences. We are able to see what Baptist principle has been exaggerated because of our environment here or there, and as well what has been neglected, and how the exaggeration and neglect have combined to produce Baptist peculiarity of type which we may designate irregularity. Love and loyalty to Jesus Christ is basal with us all and produce love and loyalty to each other. Out of the same quarry we got our stone and by the same pattern shaped it. Our space was not always the same and our structures of doctrine or form vary but never so far as not to fit together into a temple of unity. Common origin, common spirit, common task, common Lord; one people and the vitalizing sympathy will flow through all the body and make its growth grander and more uniform.

4. Our principles are not only common but we have brought into bold relief *the finality of Baptist principles* for the religion of humanity. It has remained for the most individualistic of all Christian denominations to effect the most real and vital unity of its forces. This unexpected fact has disclosed the basis on which it rests. Baptist principles in each human sphere state the final principle of the religious relation (See address of President Mullins, Review and Expositor, October, 1904). It has been suggested that the next Baptist Congress may do well to build its programme on the conception, *Baptist Principles the Ultimates of Our Faith.*

5. Finally the Congress signalizes the truest conception yet gained of the *Baptist Mission.* It is a world mission. We have seen the world before in a way; but at London we heard the voices of the world calling to us in varied tongue for that which we became conscious anew of holding for the world. And we heard anew the Master's message of old, "Go, teach all nations."

III. FORECAST—CALL.

And the practical issue of it all?

1. The true and worthy elements of the Congress are to perpetuate themselves in the Baptist World Alliance with quinquennial meetings, the first to be held in America in 1910. There will be more than perpetuation, there will be projection and expansion. We shall see what, after all, is left of net results of this Congress and on this we will build and advance.

2. We shall see that God is thus uniting the Baptist people of the world into a definite force that they may become a great definitive force in the world's redemption. We come into our self-consciousness when the time is ripe for the operation of our principles and our form of the Christian faith, at the time when most of all the world needs us and will receive us if we come as expressing truly the spirit of our Christ. The political, social and religious movements of the world in many of their phases unite in making this an age for the Baptists.

3. Baptists in all the lands where they are so few as to feel a sense of segregation and loneliness, and at the same time of missionary obligation will have new courage for their tasks as they realize their share in the common brotherhood. Already we learn how this is true on the continent of Europe and in heathen lands. As our unity becomes more a fact and bears the test of time the power of fraternity will increase. Our people will be more hopeful, agressive and successful.

4. Baptists must take up their mission to the Christian world. We shall not become a horde of proselyters, God forbid! We shall go to others in the same spirit in which we are approaching one another. Many of us shall be amazed to find how far much of the Protestant world has grown toward the Baptist position and how our own attitude toward others has been undergoing modification. If humbly we express the spirit of Jesus Christ; if while loving the name Baptist for its history, we still make no contention for the name; if eschewing all spirit of the proselyte we show the "sweet reasonableness" of the Baptist principle we shall contribute enormously to the union of believers in spirit and fact and realize in our measure the prayer of Jesus to this end.

5. Finally, we shall reduce the differences and increase the oneness of Baptist faith and practice in matters which now partly divide and differentiate us. At the same time we shall hope to lift into vital activity and loving fellowship that mass of Baptists which constitute the most deplorable sect among us, the careless and indifferent who came not with us to our task.

Such is the work ready to the hand of Baptists in their World Alliance. For it there must be the living alliance with the world of God's power.

MANLINESS IN THE MINISTRY.

ANNUAL ADDRESS AT THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, DELIVERED BY R. H. PITT, D. D., LL. D.

Not at all by way of apology, but in order that we may understand one another thoroughly at the outset, let me say that I have chosen an eminently practical theme. To orators must be left the great and thrilling topics, to trained theologians the discussion of doctrinal subtleties. A plain, blunt man must needs tread a plain path, and discourse of homely things in a homely way. It is freely granted that after a session of hard work, and with the doors of practical life, with all its hopes and fears and high and solemn duties, opening before you, you deserve something better, but it is earnestly hoped, nevertheless, that this practical homily may not be wholly useless.

Why should I speak of Manliness in the Ministry? Is there a lack of this strong and sturdy quality among those who minister in sacred things? Are there special temptations to which ministers are subject, and which, if not successfully resisted, break down and injure, if they do not destroy this quality? Certainly it is not the purpose of this discourse to bring any railing accusation against a calling, which beyond a doubt, still holds, as it has always held, many of the frankest, noblest, truest and most courageous of men. Still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that in the world at large the opinion prevails that ministers as a class have something effeminate about them. Nor can we deny that there is too frequently some ground for this opinion.

There are current two notions of ministers. One is that they constitute a sort of priestly caste which is to be distinguished by a peculiar dress, a peculiar speech, and peculiar manners. They are to be rigidly limited in their activities to matters well within the scope of

their peculiar mission. They are shut out of healthy social life; they are to take little or no part in the concerns of government; they may not enter the army except as non-combatants; they must not hold office unless in rare and exceptional cases; they are forbidden amusements, except a little fishing (supposed to have some apostolic flavor about it), or an occasional lapse into the mild and inoffensive croquet with the ladies on a velvet lawn. The laws deal with them sometimes as extraordinary persons. In some states they are not taxed as other persons. In some they are not subject to jury duty. This view of the ministry is encouraged in a degree by the ministry itself. Some denominations, by special regulations, prescribe the sort of dress their preacher must wear. It is well known that in our ritualistic churches reading and speaking are lost arts. The affected, artificial, unnatural voice and manner, which are regarded as quite the thing in some pulpits, would be simply intolerable elsewhere.

It is inevitable that among those who hold and encourage these views the ministry should, at length, come to be regarded as a resort for men who are not fit for the rough work of the world, who are not exactly women, but who suffer from a steady process of effeminization, and it is beyond a doubt true that ministers themselves who hold these views become after a while soft and yielding, lacking in that high courage, that robust self-respect, that holy and fearless temper, without which neither man nor minister counts for much in the fierce and relentless conflicts of which life is largely made up.

"What care I for caste or creed?
It is the deed, it is the deed:
What for class or what for clan?
It is the man, it is the man;
Heirs of love, and joy, and woe,
Who is high, and who is low?
Mountain, valley, sky and sea,
Are for all humanity."

It is not intended to under-value womanly qualities.

On the contrary, let us be swift and sure to say that without these the world would be a dismal place and life would lose its chief charm for us. But one reason, I have often thought, why women may not preach, is that women are not men. It takes *a man* to be a minister of the New Testament. Boswell who was always eager to know Dr. Johnson's views on anything and everything—and the old gentleman was usually not reluctant to express his opinion—once said to the old sage, that he had just heard a Quakeress preach, and waited for the great Doctor's comment. It was forthcoming. "A woman's preaching," said Dr. Johnson, "is like a dog's walking on his hind legs. It is not done well, but you are surprised to find it done at all." The ministry is a man's work, not a woman's. A manly woman is a distortion. A womanly man is an abortion.

The other view of the ministry, evidently growing more popular and prevalent, is that it is merely one of the many vocations in which men may serve God and their fellow men, that though it is entered in obedience to a conviction, different, it may be, in source, in kind and in degree, from that which frequently lies behind the choice of other occupations, yet entrance upon it does not separate the minister from those to whose highest interests he devotes himself. He may still utter, and indeed with a deeper meaning than Terence knew, "I am a man; nothing of what is human do I count foreign to myself." This is the view of the ministry which I myself most strongly hold, and am prepared most stoutly to defend. The minister must be first of all a man, a man among men, with convictions, and sympathies, and interests not at all limited by his special work, but as wide as the race. Believing this I should like to witness the disappearance of all peculiarities of speech, and dress, and manner. I should like to see substituted for the professional tone which too often mars our modern preaching, good, honest, straightforward speaking. I should like to see the minister full of patriotism and public spirit, not seeking or accepting immunity from public burdens on account of

his calling, but doing his full part with utmost cheerfulness for the public weal.

"But wiser, happier, holier they,
Who, undismayed, confront the strife;
Fly not, poor weaklings, from the fray;
But share, then staunch, the wounds of life;
Maintain amid their madding kind—
Too human far to dwell apart—
The calm of a monastic mind,
The quiet of a cloistered heart."

What do I mean by manliness? It is not easy to give a satisfactory definition. It is a composite quality. Into it enter courage, modesty, frankness, generosity, truthfulness, gentleness, sincerity, humility, loyalty. But these qualities are found in women, too. The quality of manliness results, not only from the presence of these constituent elements, but from the manner in which they are combined. The elements are so mixed that we instinctively recognize the product. While we may not be able to define, we do understand very well just what we mean when we speak of this quality. A rich rose defies description but its ineffably sweet fragrance is none the less grateful because it eludes analysis, and its rarely beautiful coloring none the less pleasing to our eyes because we are unable to picture it to others.

There are certain aspects of the minister's calling which test in a very subtile way this quality of manliness. The very sacredness and intimacy of his relations with his flock, and with the community, though appealing strongly to the highest and noblest within him, may sometimes be a source of peril. For who can always be high and noble in his nature? Wise parents are careful not to indulge their children too freely. Genuine affection is often fond and foolish. Ministers may be spoiled as well as children. Many a church has blighted the career of some promising young minister by extravagant and foolish praise. He is the especial pet of good and noble women, who in the kindness of their gentle hearts,

shower on him tokens of their esteem. He may come to think of himself more highly than he ought to think. For such a time as this, the short-horned deacon has come to the kingdom, in whose economy he now finds a useful place. Alas, alas, if in the absence of such wholesome, though unwelcome correction, the young fellow accepts the too flattering estimates of these kind hearts as accurate and ultimate. One such I well remember, who, when he had reached this stage, straightway evinced more zeal for millinery than for the souls of men, cared more for the cut of his coat than for the substance of his sermons, and finally fell so low that he carefully plastered his hair with pomatum, saturated his handkerchief with perfumery (in which his taste was not the best), until it was said on good authority that you could smell him down two flights of stairs.

The fact that the minister speaks, as it were, *ex cathedra,* with none to molest him or make him afraid, is also a source of danger and a test of his manhood. That knightly and chivalrous sense of fairness, which is of the very essence of manliness, may suffer seriously in this way. The fact that there is no one to review or answer what he says, ought to make him doubly careful. But too frequently it has the opposite effect.

The minister ought to be anxious to gain and hold the favor of the people, not for degraded or unworthy motives, but that his usefulness may be enlarged. Let him not forget, however, that he is first of all an ambassador for Christ, a preacher of righteousness, and that his first duty is to be faithful to his mission and loyal to the truth. These are just a few of the many temptations which lie along the path of the minister, and which, if not successfully resisted, may take the manliness out of him and leave him a mere contemptible weakling. And since these temptations do not respect persons, and the best and truest among you will be subjected to them, I am led to speak a plain and kindly word on this theme.

There are three relations in which the minister must exhibit and express this quality. First, that which he sus-

tains to the churches he leads and serves. Churches have rights. There have been ministers who seemed to regard the pastorate as furnishing them only a base of operations and a source of supplies. Their main interests were elsewhere. Their churches were merely incidental in their lives. Sometimes they were notably useful in very worthy enterprises, denominational, educational, philanthropic or what-not, but the little drudgeries of the pastorate had no charm for them. The aged woman, sick and weary, longing for the consolations of the gospel, might die and be buried by a strange preacher, while the pastor disported himself at some association or other public meeting. A pastor's first duty is to his church. It would seem to be common, simple, rudimentary honesty, to put it on the lowest ground, not to take money for the performance of tasks which one proceeded to neglect. After some years of observation, extending over a relatively wide field, I have come to the deliberate conclusion that four-fifths of the premature separations between pastor and people are due to the failure of the pastor to recognize this simple and elementary fact.

Sometimes ministers are called away from the pastorate into yet larger affairs of the kingdom. There, as elsewhere, they must be upright and downright, doing honest work for honest pay, not presuming upon the good will of their brethren or bringing painful embarassment to their friends by flagrant neglect of plain duty. This is fundamental and may seem to be commonplace, but it is important, and I am convinced, not a wholly unnecessary warning.

The minister, too, must cultivate and preserve his *self-respect* in his relations with his people. In recent years we have put emphasis very properly on the business aspects of the pastorate, but I trust the day is far distant when the pastoral relation shall be reduced to the bare, hard proposition of so much work for so much pay. Even in our strenuous and business-like time, the tender sentiment which invests the minister has not wholly disappeared. To this sentiment he will respond, with every instinct

of manliness, with a service which cannot be estimated in money, and which will not stop short at any expenditure of time and labor, or any sacrifice of preference or pleasure. Some such sentiment as that which runs through these fugitive lines will inspire him and hold him to his task through the long and toilsome days, and through the weary watches of the night:

"Love wore a threadbare dress of gray
And toiled upon the road all day.
Love wielded pick and carried pack,
And bent to heavy loads the back.
Though meagre fed, and sorely tasked,
One only wage love ever asked—
A child's white face to kiss at night;
A woman's smile by candlelight."

It is almost harsh to say that the minister's manliness may be injured by the kindness of his people, and yet candor compels the statement that this is true. Gifts will come from individual friends, and sometimes the people will rise spontaneously and pound you. One of my brother editors, who is a bachelor, speaks rather scornfully of these demonstrations, but I have not yet reached the heights from which I can look down with contempt upon such a scene. There is something very merry and delightful in the procession as it winds its cheerful way along the country road to the parsonage, and when they drawn near the house, and presently burst in, laden with their good things, and give the pastor and his family a delightful surprise, only a crusty curmudgeon of a bachelor could fail to have the cockles of his heart warmed by the sight. As a matter of fact, the pastor, dear simple-hearted fellow, has known for a week past that something was brewing, for he saw the groups gathered at the church and noticed how the conversation ceased as he drew near. Any misgivings he may have had concerning these proceedings were relieved the day before by the wife of Deacon Adam. She had suffered untold miseries, carrying the awful secret in her breast, and had sought relief by telling the pastor's wife what was coming.

She, of course, that night, when the children had been tucked snugly away in their beds, broke the news to her husband. So, after all, it wasn't so much of a surprise to them, but the cheerful company never knew better. I frankly confess that I always print the list of things when asked to do so. Hams, sugar, flour, preserves, coffee, tea, canned fruits, a barrel of beef, a quarter of lamb, a barrel of oysters, a Morris chair for the preacher and a crazy quilt for his wife, feed for the horse and cow, toys for the children, and dear knows how many other unclassified and unclassifiable gifts. And then when the merry laughter and song have ceased, and the joyous company have gone their way, I like, in fancy, to go with the faithful preacher and his wife into the store room and help them untie their packages and bestow their goods! Alas, when under the hand of Providence, one gives up the regular pastorate for an editorial career, these simple joys vanish. The editor has his poundings, to be sure but oh!

"The difference to me."

All this is pleasant and useful, and if rightly interpreted, strengthens the bond between pastor and people and makes a new appeal to him to do his best for those whose love thus overflows toward him. And yet the preacher must be careful always to let it be understood that he is not a mendicant. Doubly careful must he be never to hint or to allow others who in any way represent him to hint for him that such extraordinary demonstrations of kindness are desired or expected. It is very easy to rub the bloom from this peach, but impossible to restore it.

Some measure of *independence* the pastor must exhibit in the presence of his people. He will do well to consult freely and frequently the more experienced among his brethren, but he must at length have a mind of his own. He is the servant of his people, and yet he is a leader of his people. He is not invested with authority over them, but if he has not prevailing influence, which is better than authority, then he is foredoomed to abject failure. Some power of iniative he must posess. It is pitiful to see a pastor hesitating and halting when some high call of duty is sounding

and resounding, to see what his people think of the situation. He must respect his brethren, he must love them sincerely, but in the name of all that is manly and true, let him not be afraid of them. Whatever else he loses, let him preserve uninjured his independence of thought and action. When that is gone, his manhood is but a memory, and his ministry collapses. Of course the sensible man will distinguish independence from eccentricity and self-reliance from obstinacy.

My brethren, it is given to but few to be great preachers with brilliant oratorical gifts, commanding the attention and exciting the admiration of vast multitudes. But to every one of us it is possible to be simple, sincere, sturdy, faithful, honest, high-minded. And such manhood as this counts for much in the work of the ministry. To be faithful and just in the common every-day experiences through which we pass, to be constant in our friendships, to be diligent in our duty, to be loyal to our obligations, to be self-denying in our spirit—this is to be manly in the ministry.

"To change life's cloth, not trim it for display,
Christ gave his charter.
All men can be religious when they pray,
But few at barter.
Better be self-denying every day
Than once a martyr."

The manliness of the minister finds many opportunities for expression in the relation which he bears to the community in which he lives. To have a good report of them that are without is a worthy ambition. The old line between secular and sacred has faded out. All of life belongs to Christ. No department of it is beyond his dominion. The minister of Jesus is no hooded and robed ecclesiastic, shutting himself out from the affairs of men, and hiding himself away from their struggles and conflicts. The minister, of all men, must be a brother to humanity and a citizen of the world. He ought to be the first citizen of his community. He may not enter into

the petty strifes of practical politics. He may not indulge any overweening personal ambition, but he may, and he ought to, bear witness boldly and clearly for all that is clean and high in civic life. When great moral issues arise he ought not to keep silent. He cannot be silent without cowardice. Many public questions will occur on which he ought to align himself. Not long ago a minister of my acquaintance, who had been temporarily engaged in teaching, went back into the pastorate. In a few months he was recognized as a leader in all that concerned the good of the community. He was foremost in promoting public education. He helped in organizing and leading the forces that drove the saloon from the county. He earnestly and publicly advocated the improvement of the country roads. In a word he was a progressive, public-spirited citizen as well as an earnest, faithful and able minister. He sought no honors or emoluments for himself. He took part in no personal contests for position. But on questions which concerned the public good he was heard, and with ever increasing respect. When delicate health made it necessary for him to lay down his work and change his residence the whole county grieved over his departure.

In the late Virginia Constitutional Convention, one of the ablest bodies ever gathered in the state, there were two ministers, one Baptist and one Presbyterian. They were sent by their respective communities with practical unanimity. Neither of them turned his hand over to secure the office. Who will say that these men violated in any way the proprieties of their calling by accepting this honor and discharging these duties, laid upon them by their fellow citizens? In the memorable body of which they were members, they bore themselves with dignity, took active and useful part in framing the best Constitution ever framed for Virginia, and the leading lawyer at the Virginia bar, himself a member of the Convention, told me that he regarded the Baptist minister in question as one of the clearest headed, most sensible, reasonable, and useful members of that distinguished body. It is my

own conviction, for which no one else must be held responsible, that much of the reproach which has been cast upon ministers, that they are lacking in robust manliness, that they are effeminate and feeble, may be taken away by a judicious and earnest participation in public affairs, by a genuine and vigorous public spirit.

The minister in his relation to the truth which he preaches will have his manhood frequently and severely tested. He does not deal with a fixed and finished system. Into the substance of his preaching there must enter both dynamic and static elements. One principle which must guide him amid the perplexities that are sure to encompass him is loyalty to what is received and established among those to whom he ministers. In recent years there has been a marked disposition to disregard this principle. For my own part I have never understood how honest men can hold that a minister may eat the bread of a denomination while he seeks to undermine and overthrow the body of truth for which the denomination stands. This is not to deny freedom of opinion. It simply denies the liberty to do wrong. When one finds that his views of religious doctrine differ seriously from those of the church to which he ministers, or the denomination to which he belongs, let him instantly without question or hesitation make known his position, and relieve his brethren of all responsibility for his convictions. To act in any other way is unjust to all concerned, and not least of all to the minister himself. For how can he maintain his self-respect while he hides his real sentiments and misleads his people by his silence? Or, how can he maintain his moral integrity while he uses his position and influence, secured through his supposed loyalty to a set of theological beliefs, to overturn and discredit those beliefs? If he wishes to assert his freedom of opinion without reference to the rights and privileges of those to whom he is related in some representative way, why the world is wide and inviting. Let him depart, for he cannot remain without the sacrifice of his own manliness.

I am fully aware that I am now about to enter disputed

territory. I would, therefore, walk very softly and circumspectly. I must bear in mind the principles which I have just announced, and this I shall honestly seek to do. But in such a discussion as this I cannot omit some reference to the minister's relation to the old and the new phases of truth.

The old theological statements are certainly entitled to respect. They were fashioned by thoughtful and conservative men, students, earnest devout and intelligent, of the Scriptures. They have stood for a long time, some of them for many centuries, and have been held in esteem as adequate and valuable formularies. In our day, and more particularly in our land, there is too scant respect for that which age has made venerable. It will not do for us to dismiss these statements in any hasty or superficial way. Nor will it do for us to regard them with indifference. Some of them stand, still untouched, and unapproached in clearness, cogency and comprehensiveness. It would be too much to say that they are final and ultimate, but they are strong and respectable, and we may reasonably accept them and use them until we are supplied with something which is plainly more useful and more satisfactory. Let no young minister suppose that irreverence toward and disregard for these honored and historic formularies of faith are marks of intellectual growth. A shallow and superficial sciolist may inveigh against the creeds of Christendom just as fiercely as may the strongest and wisest among us. Do not sympathize for a moment with the notion that there is any lack of manly vigor in sincere and unswerving loyalty to the old truth, and real and abiding respect for the old statements.

But may not one be loyal in spirit and temper to the old, while, at the same time, he is hospitable to the new? A venerable minister and a great preacher withal, whom I often heard in my youth, was fond of saying "What is new is not true, and what is true is not new." From that sentiment I utterly dissent, preferring to say with the old Puritan "The Lord has yet more light and truth to break

forth from his word." While there is a presumption in favor of the old, one must never forget that the final question is neither Is it old? nor Is it new? but Is it true? When the Lord's hand is in it, the verdict of the world which saith the old is better is reversed.

Perhaps there is no aspect of a preacher's life more serious and solemn, or more perplexing and embarrassing than this with which we are now dealing. It is so easy and so common to generalize about our own age and time that I am always reluctant to do it, especially as we know less about our own than about almost any period in the history of men. And yet we are safe in saying that our own time is marked peculiarly by agitation and unrest in the world of religious belief and thought. In an atmosphere of this sort you are to live and do your work. I know of no better counsel to offer than this: Be a man in the midst of it all. Be frank, and transparent, and teachable, and faithful. Keep your heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life. In it are the springs of character and the sources of strength. The clean and pure, and loyal, and upright heart will help you in every perplexing experience of this kind.

I believe there are three fair and reasonably accurate tests of intellectual and spiritual growth. The first is that the number of articles in one's creed diminishes. At forty we are not infallibly sure of quite so many things as we were at twenty. There has been a process of elimination. We need not be startled at this. It is characteristic of life itself. One fact at least in the theory of evolution seems to be well verified. The organs that are useless fall away.

The second test is that the things necessary to be believed in order to our peace of mind diminish with our growth. "Our creed continually shortens around Christ." Many subsidiary and minor beliefs change their form or disappear, but our hope is not dimmed and our faith is not shaken. When first we become aware of these changes we shall feel alarmed. We do not understand their significance. We overestimate their importance.

But presently we find that these items of our early faith were not vitally related to our souls, and that as they have fallen away from us, the great, commanding, regnant, tremendous facts and truths stand out in clearer light.

The third test is this: The things that remain are more firmly established than ever. They have been tested by experience, they have woven themselves into our lives. They have strengthened us in the hour when the battle went sore against us. They have brought solace to our souls when sorrow's darkness settled down about us. They have filled us with a deathless hope in the midst of disappointments and disasters. In their light we have taken up our tasks while courage and cheer filled our hearts and a new song filled our mouths.

Young gentlemen, as you go forth to the arduous work, the heavy tasks, the subtle temptations, the unknown trials, and the overflowing and uplifting, and sublime joys of your calling I am sure that I can utter no better prayer for you than that you shall be loyal always in spirit to the old, hospitable to the new, anchored safely in Christ. Lift up your hearts, take up your burden, go forth with morning faces to your work. God reigns and all shall be well.

"For darkness passes; storms shall not abide;
A little patience and the fog is past.
After the sorrow of the ebbing tide,
The singing floods return in joy at last.

The night is long, and pain weighs heavily,
But God will hold his world above despair.
Look to the east, where up the lurid sky
The morning climbs. The day shall yet be fair."

ANENT READING, IN THE CITY OF ROME, THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

BY J. HUNT COOKE.

In a piazza near the centre of Rome, on the summit of a column more than 120 feet high, stands a statue of the Apostle Paul. This is almost the one recognition in this city of him who gave to the church here the grandest revelation that ever was written of what it is most important for man to know. The column is pagan, placed there in honor of Marcus Aurelius, so that the expense of the erection was not incurred as a memorial of the apostle. An inscription on the pedestal, put there by order of Pope Sextus V asserts that the column was first erected in memory of Antoninus Pius, thus affording an illustration of the unreliability of papal tradition even when endorsed by an infallible pope. The fact is not without significance that amidst the crowd of magnificent churches in Rome, dedicated to S. Maria, S. Pietro, and not a few unknown saints, I have not found one of any note dedicated to S. Paul. Outside the city, a mile and a half beyond the gates, sustained chiefly by subscription from foreign lands, is the grand erection of S. Paolo fuori le mura. But even in this church Peter shares the honors. It would almost appear that the Romans are jealous lest Paul should be considered the equal of Peter, and yet there is no satisfactory evidence that Peter was ever at Rome, much less that he accepted a bishopric in the city; whilst there can be no doubt that Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans gave the greatest gift that ever a man made to a city. The indifference to the Apostle of the Gentiles would be mysteriously incomprehensible were it not certain that the teaching of this great apostle is seen to be antagonistic to the dogmas of the papacy, and that his epistle to the Galatians is opposed to its

unfounded claims. Yet it is strange, and amongst the mysteries that puzzle the visitor to Rome, that whilst Paul wrote to the city his greatest epistle and whilst in the city wrote at least five of the most precious of those inspired oracles which abide with us to-day as perennial fountains of holy thought, yet here, by people professedly Christian, they are uncared for and even by many unknown.

And it is further remarkable that, in comparison with what might have been expected, very little can be learned here concerning the visits of the apostle. I have diligently visited the places, to which tradition attracts, as marking his footsteps. It has to be kept in mind that the soil of Rome has risen at least twenty feet since his time. There is the crypt of the church in Via Lata, said to be the site of the apostle's hired house. There is the neglected church of St. Prisca, in a back lane, of which the evidence is better, that somewhere near was the residence of Aquila and Priscilla. There is the church of S. Pudenziana, thought by many to be the site of the house of of Pudens. There is a place in the Jews' quarter where Paul is reported to have preached but the proof of this is far from being satisfactory. There are the ruins of the Domus Flaviorum on the Palatine, where presumably the trial took place. There is a house at the corner of the Via degli Strengari where he is said to have held the conference with the Jews recorded in the book of the Acts. There is the Mamertine prison with legends transparently false. There is the place where Paul is said to have taken farewell of Peter before his martyrdom, and there is Tre Fontana, where there is a monastery in which monks prepare a fiery spirit and tell a ghastly story of the great Apostles' death. It is almost certain that whilst at Rome the Apostle dwelt in two houses; one with Aquila and Priscilla on the Aventine, and another with Pudens on the Viminal. But papal authorities have shown great carelessness in regard to the identification of the sites.

Visiting these places in a condition of mind open and anxious to learn something more of the great saint,

to whom we owe so much, I confess, sadly, that I am not indebted to one of them for a single thought that could throw light on any of his epistles or movements. I do not owe papal authorities one single thank for enabling me to understand Paul a little more. They have plenty to say about Peter, of which, unhappily, I am unable to believe a single statement. Nevertheless leaving all the miserable and, for the most part, lying legends, I venture to think that since I have been at Rome some helpful light has come to me on some of Paul's writings; for which I bless the true giver of all light and knowledge.

Wandering in the municipal museum of antiquities I came across an ancient tablet brought there recently from the river side, which had the record of five curators being appointed by the Emperor Claudius to the dignity of conservators of the river Tiber. Of these, two bear the name of Paulus. This indicates that there was, at that time, in Rome a noble family, or gens, or clan, of this name. According to Roman custom, the member of an honorable gens might not use the hereditary surname of his house without permission. It is probable that Saul of Tarsus was of the Paulus gens, but could not use the name of the noble family with which he was connected without some authoritative permission, and this was granted him when brought into connection with the Proconsul Sergius Paulus at Paphos, whose name appears on this tablet, and who was converted by the Apostle's teaching. Then, Luke writes of "Saul, who also is called Paul;" and by that name he was known ever after. If this view is accurate, it clears some interesting questions. Paul's writings indicate not only mental power, but considerable culture, and that of the Latin type. This is what might be expected, when it is seen, that he was connected with a family of Roman rank, and hence had moved among persons of cultivated manners, and in early life had been surrounded by influences of a superior character. Paul was a Jew, and thought as a Jew; but his epistles show an intellect trained, not alone on Rabbinical literature, but also on that of Greece and

Rome. The Roman gentleman of that age took much delight in Greek language and literature.

With such an education we can well understand his eager desire as a Roman to visit Rome, and as a Christian to touch the springs of thought in the metropolis of the world. "I must also see Rome" he 'purposed in the spirit.' "So must thou bear witness also in Rome" his Lord said to him. In his Epistle to the Romans, three times, in strong terms he expresses his desire, of many years, and of frequent prayer, to fulfill his wish often purposed and hindered. At length he is in the city. Visitors to Rome from distant lands tell of the quickened pulse and incandescent expectation with which they entered for the first time. What must have been the emotion of that great soul as he drew near! It was his own city, the subject of many a dream in boyhood, the fulfillment of the longing of years, and he entered on a mission direct from his Lord. Rome was then in the zenith of her glory. She had just sat down on her throne as empress of the world. Her palaces and temples were in their greatest splendor. On arriving Paul probably passed the Palatine and went through the Forum on his way to the Pretorium. He could not fail to notice those splendid buildings whose ruins charm us to-day, the columns of the temple of Castor and Pollux, of which the three remaining are so conspicuous at the present hour; and the noble Basilica of Julia, and the grand facade of the temple of Saturn, with its broad steps, of white marble glistening in the bright sunshine. Weary with possibly a walk of eleven miles since early dawn his vigor revives as he looks around. A troop of Roman soldiers with heavy tramp crosses the open space. Along the Via Sacra generals and senators drive in chariots rattling on the paving blocks of travertine. A multitude of indolent men and women are gathered listening to an oration from the Rostra. There are noisy children playing their games. High towering over all is the Palatine rock, with its magnificent palaces the roofs glittering with gilded tiles. As we stand to-day in the sepulchre of that bye-gone splendor

of architecture, astonished at the bewildering extent of the ruins, the "crumbs dopt from the feast of time," in imagination they take form, the grandest erections of the human race. Horace makes us acquainted with the scene; and we wonder how they appeared to the Apostle Paul, and what influence they had upon his thought. For we can not resist the stream of inflowing ideas.

The consideration of sub-conscious mental activity is full of interest. If Paul has not left on record any impressions he may have received of the scenes he witnessed, still they must have influenced his thought. Seeds may be wafted into a garden, unnoticed, and there remain until they find root and grow. So in our minds. Beneath the surface of consciousness seed-thoughts find a place, lie and germinate unobserved, and in time spring up and bear flowers and fruits. Though Paul has left no mention of these wonderful scenes in his writings he may still have been so affected by them that they influenced and guided his thoughts. It is well agreed that whilst at Rome he wrote the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians and Philemon. Probably that to the Ephesians was the first, and written soon after his entrance into the city. So it appeared to me and in that light I studied it at Rome. The consideration before us is not affected by the question as to whom it was addressed.

A prominent thought in this epistle is the Imperial nature of Christianity. It is found elsewhere in Paul's writing, but here it is the dominant note. A visit to the Palatine and Forum would nourish this. Paul stood there just after all the nations of earth, refined and barbarous had been "gathered together in one." And the Emperor, whose dwelling was in those vast palaces, had "all things put under his feet" so far as earthly rule was concerned and was raised above all the monarchs of the world. The thought of this must have influenced men's thoughts in various ways. Most would be dazzled with the splendor and believe that it would endure with irresistible might. There is a moral grandeur in the Apostle seeing in all

this but the beauty of an evanescent bubble which ere long would burst, and fixing his thought on the solid foundation and divine strength of the kingdom of his Lord. There is something very sublime in Paul, a prisoner, chained to a soldier, writing to his friends and not even mentioning the glories of Cæsar, but telling them that he knows "the mystery of the Divine will" which is "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance." What a subject for a great picture when an artist shall arise who will study the New Testament, rather than the paltry church legends! And again, "God hath set Christ at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and has put all things under his feet and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." There is a sublime faith in this reference to the church. What was it at that hour? In Rome it appears to have consisted of two parties. There were some educated persons of a respectable class which found a center at the house of Priscilla and Aquila, men and women to whom it was suitable to send an epistle of such profound thought as that to the Romans. And there were Jewish converts, believers, but of narrow prejudices, that gathered near the river side, who waited on the Apostle by deputation, but with whom he appears to have had but little intercourse. There is very little to lead to the conclusion that there was any united church organization in the city; but rather that there was considerable divergence amongst the professing Christians. We read of some who "by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" of those "which cause divisions and offenses." And even of some who were antagonistic to the Apostle, preaching Christ in such a way as to suppose to add affliction to his bonds. Throughout this

epistle there is evidence of a great fissure amongst the believers of that age in relation to the vocation of Israel. Paul looks through and beyond the feebleness and disunion and sees all parties formed into one new "perfect man," the body of Christ to share unutterable glory. He would look through the seen and transitory to the real and eternal. Though now we see not as yet all things put under his feet, yet all the show and glitter of that age, has "like an unsubstantial vision faded." So of all the pageants of earth. The pomp of the Vatican has taken its place, but that too is but the shifting scene of the great "lantern show of time" and will pass away. The Lord Christ and His Church are the true and permanent reality, he must reign King of Kings and Lord of Lords for ever and ever.

The splendors of the palaces of Caesars on that remarkable rock called the Palatine, were very great. The ruins to-day are bewildering in their massive extent. From that place comes the word "palace" in almost every modern language, meaning the residence of a monarch. It is suitable that the home of a king should have a splendor commensurate with the resources of his empire. To pass through a nation of extensive territory and wealth, and arriving at the dwelling of the sovereign to find it low and mean would be felt to be incongruous. Looking up at the Palatine the question might well arise: What shall be the magnificence of the palace of our King when Jesus appears in glory? Surely its splendor will be something higher than the material, than columns of gilded marble. His palace must be spiritual, where all is life, built of living stones. Hence the beautiful imagery of the second chapter of this epistle, where a palace is described "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom, all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God, through the Spirit."

The figure of the body and its members, which appears

to have been in the thought of Paul, throughout the composition of the epistle, may have been, as some think, suggested by the parable of the orator Agrippa, so well known in Rome; or it may have arisen naturally. But the finely wrought-out illustration, toward the close, of the enduement of the armor of God, leaves little doubt that it was suggested by what Paul saw in the Pretorium, where the process of arming and preparing to stand on guard must have been of very frequent occurrence.

There is one expression peculiar to this epistle to the Ephesians 'en tois 'epouraniois. It occurs in what is almost the opening sentence and is repeated several times. Our translators do not seem to have been clear whether it means places or things, high or heavenly. It is a state or region where all spiritual blessings are stored Iv. 3: it is where Christ is enthroned Iv. 20: it is where the redeemed sit together with him IIv. 6: it is where the manifold wisdom of God is revealed to principalities and powers IIIv. 10, and it is the ylace of conflict with spiritual wickedness VIv. 12. From the low valley of the Forum Paul might have looked up and seen the Palatine palace towering in the clear blue sky. There were the treasuries of the empire, there was the court where the Emperor held his throne far above the known powers and dominions of earth, and with a name above every name; there his favorites were gathered to sit with him; there were discussed and proclaimed imperial decisions for ruling the empire; and there was the scene of conflicting opinions amidst which there was peril of treachery so that the courtiers had ever to be on their guard and having done all to stand. Is it fanciful to see some suggestions here?

Very glorious and elevating is the revelation of the condition to which the believer is uplifted through faith in his risen Lord. Raised to sit with Christ, blessed with all spiritual blessings, learning the wisdom of God, and yet not free from conflict. If Paul had this suggested by the sight of the high towering Palatine palaces, it might also explain the emphasis which is found in the epistle

given to the word "access." He must have soon found the difficulty of gaining admission and an audience. For two years he waited his hearing, which it is most probable took place in the basilica, not far from the center of the summit of the famous rock. The need of a friend at court was manifest. It might well awaken gratitude that "through him we have access by one Spirit unto the Father" and "we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him."

Since then there may be traced such striking parallel between the thoughts natural to the locality, and the special spiritual teaching of the epistle; can it be fanciful to suppose that the one suggested the other? Giantism, it has been often remarked is the prevalent feature of the thought of Rome. The vastness of the ruins are overwhelming. They speak of a constant aim at world-wide dominion, and of the desire for palaces, basilicas and temples of unsurpassed splendor. The visitor, in his first letter to his friends rarely fails to show that he is deeply impressed by the unexpected extent of what he sees. It would certainly be surprising to find that Paul visited these scenes in the period of their splendor, and was unaffected. But his mind dwelt upon a city of incomparably mightier glories. So in his epistles he carries his thought into spiritual realities. A road-side puddle may suggest the ocean. The world-wide conquest and reign of the Cæsars, he saw, but at once his thoughts flew to the infinitely grander triumphs of his Lord. The wealth and splendor of the royal homes were before him, and his mind reverts to the mansions of the chosen people, above the heavens. Guided by the Holy Spirit he is not careful to pen a description of Rome, but will fill his space with thoughts of that home of Divine Love the breadth and length and depth and height of which passes knowledge. It is certainly noteworthy that the first epistle Paul wrote from Rome, should be marked by imperial ideas, and by thoughts and illustrations which might well have been suggested by what he saw. When in the light of eternity we recall the scenes and events

of earth it may be found, that the greatest glory of the magnificent palaces and temples of Rome was that they supplied the seed thoughts of an epistle which has been a revelation, a strength and a joy to generation after generation of the Church of God on earth.

Via Montebello 72, Rome, May 1, 1905.

THE PREACHER AS PROPHET.

BY REV. FREDERICK W. EBERHARDT.

The times demand a restatement of the nature and office of the Christian ministry, not that the times are any more out of joint than past times have been. By no means. This is a glorious epoch for Christian service; but the demands on the preacher are now so many and so many sided, there is danger that the emphasis of duty may be misplaced.

In every age and in every place God's messengers, consciously or unconsciously, owe all true success to those elements of power that, during the Theocracy, made the prophets the noblest interpreters of the Lord. It is this prophetic side of the preacher's calling that needs to be made more conspicuous, for in our pulpits to-day it is the prophetic note that is most wanting.

What amazing men those old prophets were. Standing with naked souls in the pure fire of heaven's Shekinah they seem enshrouded in a vast and awful solitude. The high loneliness of the chief elect is theirs: What to common men are necessities to them are as nothing. Little reck they of the favor of kings or the fettered tyranny of priestly power. We men looking back upon them after the lapse of the centuries think of these burning and shining lights as beings of another world, and yet they were to their generation what every true herald of the Gospel of Jesus Christ must be to his, for the prophet was essentially a preacher, just as the preacher, to be divinely successful, must be at the heart of things a prophet.

THE PREACHER'S PROPHETIC ENDOWMENT.

The ministry to-day must have the prophetic endowment. The popular idea of the prophets, that they were

men who *foretold* events, may be passed over without comment. True most of them did foretell events, but only as incidental to their mission in its threefold indispensable potentiality.

That which is fundamental to prophet, apostle and preacher alike is the divine call: "THE VOICE" speaking to the soul of the man, making him forever God's man. Such a man is the vehicle for the manifestation of the Holy Spirit's power among men. Such men he sends forth as his ambassadors; to Nineveh in one century, to imperial Rome in another, to India in another, or to the Islands of the East in still another.

Another qualification essential to the preacher as prophet is that of the *seer* (Heb רֹאֶה). The true prophets were all men of vision. "If there be a prophet among you, I, Jehovah, will make myself known unto him in a vision" (Num. 12:6). Of the recorded prophecies five are designated as containing respectively the vision of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Obadiah, Nahum and Habakkuk. Amos and Zechariah also contain many very striking visions. These men *saw* God. As a result, they saw the world as God would have men see it. They saw the sins of the people and the doom of sin, but also the glory of the latter day.

The New Testament apostles were seers. The heavens were opened to them. Too often, indeed, their eyes were holden, but in their best hours they could say: "We have seen the Lord." The high road to Damascus, the lonely island of Patmos, the mount of Transfiguration, the upper room at Jerusalem, the humble dwelling at Emmaus—there the glory of the Lord was revealed.

So the preacher to-day must cultivate the spiritual vision; he should see God behind the daily task, in the study of "The Word," and when he stands before the people to preach that Word. He should be able to see the world as God sees it—this great sinful world with its millions of suffering, overburdened hearts yearning towards the light and falling, thousands of them every day, into an awful hell. He should see the consoling Christ

reaching down to rescue or standing with outstretched arms to welcome to the bosom of the Father the lost sons and daughters who are willing to return. O, for the vision! The vision! Then men could preach indeed. "That certainly is the grand object of speaking to us; to show ME what THOU seest, what is in THEE; why else should one human being dare to wag his tongue to another." (Carlyle: Cromwell, vol. 2; p. 227).

As a third indispensable prophetic qualification, the preacher must be God's *for*-speaker, his mouthpiece, so to speak, the Twentieth Century נבא. Now that we have the written word of the Lord, this must be primarily the authoritative message—"the word that speaks from the eternal heart of things.' The power of the pulpit forever lies in its "thus saith the Lord." Sometimes the messenger must speak a new word. Let him be sure then and wait until he knows it is of the Lord. Evan Roberts may teach us things not in the books on Homiletics.

These three qualifications are all essential to the true messenger of the Lord. If these are lacking, all is lacking. No amount of native genius or culture can supply their place. It is a misuse of terms to call a man a prophet because he is a great thinker or gifted with poetic intuition. Emerson is not a prophet simply because he preaches an impracticable optimism. A messenger of optimism he may be, but his message is not of God. He is a seer, too, a seer of many of the deeper and most beautiful mysteries of nature, still that does not make him a prophet. He does not see God—does not know him save as some pantheistic abstraction, therefore, he cannot speak for him, and, as a consequence, has no message for the deepest longings of the human soul, nor for the unsatisfied cravings of a world conscious of its sin curse. If Emerson is a prophet by right of the message of optimism he proclaims, Zola and Nordau are prophets by right of their message of pessimism. They are seers of a profound reality, a reality of an awful state of evil, but their message is not of God.

Robert Browning has been called "the supreme prophet of our age." Now it does not need such perversion of terms to give due honor to this man's marvellous gifts. Browning is a great poet, how great, the world is only beginning to realize; but he is not a prophet. He cannot say, nor does he attempt to say: "I have seen the Lord, he called me to be his mouth-piece, and what I speak is from him to you." If there ever was a poet with the prophet's endowment it was the Florentine Dante. He was a man separated from the generation in which he lived. His vision ranged from the lowest depths of hell to the loftiest heights of paradise and his message prepared the way for the renaissance of art, literature and religion. Yet even Dante was not a prophet of God in the sense that Isaiah, Paul and Spurgeon were.

What the poet cannot say the preacher *must* say. He must have the prophetic qualification in its threefold potentiality else he cannot rightfully claim to be God's ambassador. He ought to have all the training obtainable in college and seminary, and acquire all the culture reading and personal observation can give, but he *must* have the divine call, the vision and the message.

THE PREACHER'S PROPHETIC MISSION.

The message of the preacher of the Lord under the Gospel is the message of the prophet of the Lord under the Law. We need a clearer comprehension of the unity of Divine revelation. Elijah erred grievously in this. He looked upon his work as something separate and apart and was ready to die because of fancied failure. He did not fail. His destructive work prepared the way for Elisha's constructive. The message he brought to his generation was only a fragment. No man's work is ever finished by him. The wise man is he who can make his fragment join on best with what goes before and what comes after. Across the centuries the supreme mission of the prophets comes to us as our supreme mission and this generation must pass it on to others until the end of the ages shall see its completion.

"On the earth the broken arcs; in heaven a perfect round. All that we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good, shall exist."

The mission then of prophet, apostle and preacher alike is the proclamation of the Kingdom of God—the Kingdom of God as embracing all time from Eden to the final consummation of all things at the judgment, and embracing all peoples: Jew and Gentile; European; Asiatic; African and American—this and this alone is the mission of the prophet preacher.

The proclamation of the Kingdom finds definite expression in the enthronement of Jesus Christ; but of Jesus Christ *crucified* for our sins and raised again for our justification. For this the vision of the "Thorn Crowned King" is needed. It is he alone who can fulfill all the varied prophecies of a Messiah "despised and rejected of men" and yet a "King of King and Lord of Lords."

It is as a preparation for submission to the rule of the "Thorn Crowned King" that men are to be called to repentance." This is the dominant note of ancient prophecy. It is also the dominant note in the apostolic summons, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

In proclaiming the *nature* of the Kingdom of Heaven one word stands out as the keyword of all preaching. It was so three thousand years ago; was so with Jesus and his apostles and has been so throughout the Christian centuries wherever men have understood the inevitable conflict between the Kingdom of God and the powers of darkness. That word in our English speech is PURITANISM. It is a divine word—a spirit-filled word—a word that calls to mind at once the flaming zeal of Elijah, the plaintive threnody of Jeremiah, the passionate intensity of Savonarola and the rock-firm boldness of Luther. Most of all it is a word that sums up the whole life and teaching of Jesus himself. Without the thing this word represents the message of the Kingdom is at best but sounding brass and a clanging cymbal. Every great religious reform has in it the element of Puritanism.

Modern England and America, earth's two greatest nations, were founded upon and fostered by its principles.

Puritanism means purity as opposed to corruptness and spirituality as opposed to carnality. The Kingdom of God may be summed up in this definition. The Kingdom has perhaps never been preached in power by any but puritans, from the time of Enoch to the time of Spurgeon and Clifford. Puritan history did not begin with the reign of James I. That was the time of its greatest triumph to be sure, but the history of Joseph, of Moses and Daniel; of Paul, Chrysostom, Benedict and Francis, and of how many other heroic souls, is the history of the puritan principle at war with the world spirit of evil. Now, as always, the carnal mind is enmity against God and will not be subject to his law. The material senses are still at war with that which is spiritual. To overcome the spiritual enemy of the soul is the true Holy War. This is τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα (2 Tim. 4:7) and is the chief subject of all vital art as well as of religion.

The Laocoon group does not represent the art ideal as truly as does the triumph of Christian over Apollyon or the beautiful archangel Michael over the hideous foulness of the dragon.

In music, the master mind of Wagner perceived the necessity of a vital art *theme,* as well as of a true art *form* for his great music dramas and this he found in the Niebelungen Lied, which is the old Teutonic representation of the struggle between the forces of darkness and light, evil and good, hell and Heaven. The triumph of Siegfried in the Trilogy like the triumph of Michael is an artistic imperative. It is the triumph of puritanism. So with the earlier "Tannhauser" and the later "Parsifal" where the puritan triumph is over the more subtil temptation of sensuous beauty.

In literature the transcendant art of Shakespeare sounded the lowest deeps of human passion in the four great tragedies: Hamlet, Macbeth, Lear and Othello. Here, too, we are made to see the eternal conflict between good and evil, and in each of these marvellous dramas

there is either triumph of puritanism or its vindication. This is strikingly true also of Antony and Cleopatra. But it is not in Shakespeare alone that one finds this Holy War; recall how this is the dominant theme of the Arthurian legends, of Spenser's "Faery Queen," Dante's "Divine Comedy," Milton's "Paradise Lost," Goethe's "Faust," Browning's "Pippa," "Paracelsus," and "The Ring and the Book." Sometimes, indeed, the spiritual principle triumphs only in death as in the case of Arthur, Marguerite, Pompilia, but in all these and many other great works the spirtual does triumph. It is the Divine Agony victorious.

So it is not by accident that the great modern cycle of prophecy—greatest since the apostles—should embrace the four Puritan contemporaries of the great Puritan century. The true prophetic endowment was never so manifest since John, as when Oliver Cromwell, John Milton, John Bunyan, "God intoxicated" Puritans, all of them, were prophesying and calling the people of God to forsake the Baalim and Asherim of their day; and to serve God with clean hands and a pure conscience. This generation may not need the stalwart strokes of Cromwell's invincible sword, nor the eagle vision of Milton's verse. It may not be necessary to send the servants of God to lie in Bedford goal with Bunyan or to be banished for conscience sake with Roger Williams. But this generation does need the reincarnation of the spirit of these men. There is an evident necssity for God called men with the Divine vision to preach a noble puritanism as opposed to the moral degeneracy created by the saloon, the theater and the gambling spirit of our day. We are living in a fearfully worldly age. The whole machinery of spiritual husbandry is of self-choice, being tempered in the forges of Philistia. Let the prophets arise and speak for God as holy men of old spoke when they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Such men alone have the "Gospel for an age of doubt" and for "a world of sin."

There is a word that came into our English speech from the flaming fires of the German Reformation. This word

adequately expresses the attitude of a faithful ministry. PROTESTANTISM, like puritanism, is a high-meaning word, and reveals at the heart of it a necessary truth of "The Kingdom," viz.: the open protest by lip and word against every form of unrighteousness that hinders the fruition of the spiritual hope of the millennium. Here is a new definition of a prophet that fits the case exactly: "A prophet is one who boldly and in the name of the Lord dares to contradict the Spirit of his time." This is simply saying a prophet is a God-fearing Protestant.

Now while the preacher must be ready at all times to protest against the *worldliness* of his time, his chief protest must be directed against that triple tyranny which seeks to fetter the freedom of the soul, hindering its loyalty to the religion of Jesus Christ.

Chief among these is the tyranny of scholasticism, shown in the undue exaltation of the human reason. The coarse rationalistic deism of the eighteenth century has lost its way. The guiding spirits of the French Revolution and their followers in England and America do not now influence the minds of any but ignorant, self-conceited, shallow-brains. But in place of their appeal to the baser passions, there has come, in our day, a more dangerous form of rationalism;more seductive, because associated with a nobler morality and, in part, a half-hearted concession of the worth of the Bible.

This is represented, first by the ultra-scientific spirit and second by the ultra-university dogmatism. It will not do to make too sweeping a generalization here. The preacher will soon become a tiresome ranter who opposes all the assertions of science and all the claims of the university. One is not far wrong, however, when he asserts that the superior assumptions of these two champions of unfettered investigation of all truths, have done immense harm. Modern science having usurped, first, the place of philosophy and then the place of art in the intellectual world is now ready to usurp the place of God. Its dictum is "thus saith science." This claim the preacher must oppose. Nor does he need to know all the scientist knows

in order to oppose it. It is enough that he know God. God is still God and his called ministers, not scientists, are his prophets.

Now reason is a great function of the human mind. He who discredits it is unwise. Nevertheless the Bible does not give this faculty of applied knowledge the dominant place among the controlling forces of life as modern science and the extremists of the university idea do, for as a matter of fact reason is not the dominant faculty in any department of human activity.

The primal and supreme impulse of all life is, and always has been *desire*—love, and its opposite hate. It is what men love and hate rather than what they can reason out that prompts to all action. On this account, God puts into the mouth of his servant the declaration of the first great commandment: "Thou shalt love, etc." The fear of being considered illogical has stopped the mouth of many an ambassador of God, who might otherwise have been a blessing to his generation.

In the immense field of the world's work the power of the human *will* transscends the power of reason. "I will," is the force that brings things to pass. Alexander's "I will" changed the geography of the ancient world; and the Cæsars, Charlemagnes and Napoleons coming after, conquered by the potent spell of the hero's watchword.

"I will," is the motto of commercial supremacy as represented by the magic city crouched like a huge spider in its vast iron web and drawing into its bosom the traffic of the whole earth.

In the realm of art reason must be subservient to the *imagination,* and art now has become a significant factor in our civilization. The radiant canvasses of Raphael, Titian, Da Vinci, Turner, Corot, et al., were not conceived by the rules of major and minor premises. The poems and stories that have strongly influenced mankind for good or evil were first seen in the "chambers of imagery" of our Homers and Hugos; and the glorious combinations of melody and harmony which thrill and inspire us to-day were first heard in the souls of the masters.

In the sphere of religion God has given *faith* as the controlling and directing faculty of the soul. It is faith, not reason, that solves the problems of life in relation to the Creator and gives the assurance of an immortality in his presence.

"God has a few of us whom he whispers in the ear, the rest may reason and welcome."

Love, will, imagination and faith, these four are the guiding principles and to each of these reason may prove a faithful hand-maid, but never a mistress. Boldly then, and in the name of the Lord let the preacher contradict the spirit and dicta of those self-constituted apostles of a higher rationalism which they are using as a sword to cut in pieces the Word of the Lord. To them all Theological Seminaries are failures because for-sooth they solve no problems; and Bible teaching a waste of effort because not directed by their counsel. It is not the province of Theological Seminaries to solve problems. No living problem is ever solved until its relations to eternity are understood, and that, eternity alone can show. These institutions are the schools of the prophets where divinely called men are trained to be leaders and guides of those who walk in the ways ordained of God.

Of all the yokes God's people have been made to bear in the past none has been so grievious as that which scholasticism has re-fashioned from the hands of Aristotle. No blasphemy, perhaps, has ever equalled the sacrilege of crowding the eternal, all wise, almighty, ever-existent Creater and Lord of Heaven and earth into the arbitrary confines of a syllogism. Whenever Baptists bow their necks to the *systems* of Calvin, Turrettin and Hodge they become slaves instead of the free children of light. Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened?

Appealing to another side of human nature, but equally as tyrannous as that just considered is the spirit of commercialism. Mammon is just as ready to fetter the religion of Jesus Christ as he is to rule over the earthly affairs of earthly men. In his prophetic capacity the preacher must warn this generation of their danger.

Men are prompt enough in expressing abhorence for the Tetzels and Judases within the church, they are forward in denouncing Nepotism and Simony. But the love of the almighty dollar, or its equivalent, which made the Tetzels and Judases, etc., is still all too prevalent, even in the hearts of the elect. For love of money the great business world is arrayed against the spirit of the teaching of Jesus. Christian business men openly assert that the Sermon on the Mount cannot be applied to commercial ethics, and so the business world is unwilling to change its ethical standards, the Sermon on the Mount is to that world but a vague and far-off beautiful dream. Commercialism is taking away God's Sabbath. Fearful inquities are being licensed with the assistance of churchmen's votes and are being defended by Christian lawyers. Men high in church affairs grow rich by dishonest means and crowds of poor men try the same means, but, failing, curse the rich. All this is not because men love evil rather than good, but because, like Balaam, they love the *hire* of wrong doing. Now here is a sad truth. The trumpet call of the pulpit gives forth a very uncertain sound on this theme. Preachers so very often measure their own success, and their friends and acquaintances do it for them, not by what they accomplish for the glory of the Lord, nor by what they suffer for him, but by what the remuneration of their labors amounts to in dollars and cents. The churches who can afford to pay the largest salaries to minister and choir are the churches most sought after. These churches, though composed of lovely people, so often arrogate to themselves the right to call to their pulpits the most brilliant and most successful men; yes, unconsciously perhaps, dictate to the Holy Spirit the call. Is it not all too true? And is it right that it should be true? Does Christ Jesus want our best men in the richest churches?

And what shall be said of the commercialism of which the "press" is the typical exponent! What the department store is to the business world, the newspaper is to the intellectual. Along with the news department, the

financial department, the advertising department, the sporting department, etc., our great "dailies" have now their *religious* department. But the religious department, every whit as much as the sporting department, is there simply to aid the financial success of the paper. A Calvinistic editor will give more space to a Unitarian speaker than to a Presbyterian if he thinks his readers prefer the former, and a Baptist editor will publish an entire lecture of some noted infidel in preference to a half-column report of a World's Congress. There is scarcely an editor, from the great journals of New York down to the most insignificant country weekly, who does not stand ready to dogmatize on the subject of the pulpit and pew, and who would hestitate a moment to use all the power of his paper against any preacher who would jeopardize his income by assailing the paper's methods as ungodly. There are exceptions to be sure. Thank God thre are always exceptions, but it does look as though in modern commercialism we are reviving the doctrine that might is right. Let the ministry be brave enough to proclaim that right is right and woe to them that call evil good and good evil. After all it is to the pulpit our age must look for the molding of public sentiment on questions of ethics and not to the laboratory, the university or the newspaper, without a prophetic ministry, however this can never be.

There remains finally the tyranny of ecclesiasticism against which the preacher as prophet must protest. There are two distinct ideas in men's minds in their search after truth, that of substance and that of form. These ideas lie at the basis of all our understanding of men and measures, and of God and his works. If man's search is for the soul of things he is a seeker after realities, and finding them he becomes a true son of wisdom. Ecclesiasticism deals with forms of service and belief while true religion deals with its substance. God's appeal, through his ministers, is the heart to the man—to that which is the real life. The form without the substance he rejects.

It is not difficult to protest lustily against the bondage of Romish ecclesiasticism with its terrible history of perversion and persecution. Baptists are not Protestants in a church history sense of the term. The protestors of the Diet of Spires would have made short work of them could they have had their way, but Baptists are Protestants in the prophetic sense. The two fundamental principles of our churches: the absolute over-lordship of Jesus in the individual soul, and the implicit acceptance of the Bible as his revealed will to be believed and practiced—make it incumbent upon us to withstand not only Papal perversions, but also the introduction as a necessary part of religion of *anything* other than the requirements of the Bible.

Ritualism must first be considered. The rule of the New Testament is the rule of the Spirit. Beyond the administration of the two ordinances and the command to assemble for worship there seems to be absolutely nothing binding upon the churches as to form. Even ordination does not seem to be obligatory. The Spirit is everything. This being true, if Dr. Strong correctly expresses the trend of Baptist progress in stating that without the introduction of some form of ritualism into the worship of our churches the denomination cannot hold its own, *he has pronounced our doom.* When spirituality in the Holy Ghost, soul liberty in Jesus Christ and Bible loyalty fail to keep us afloat, ritualism will prove but a rotten, water-logged expediency.

More persistently dogmatic than the encroachments of ritualism is the claim of traditionalism. Baptists have a spiritual ancestry of which they need not be ashamed. Just here, however, we are in danger. Our spiritual fathers whose beliefs this generation is setting up as landmarks would be among the first to repudiate this claim of authority. Changing the words of the old political slogan the challenge of landmarkism is: "Our fathers! may they always be right, but *right* or *wrong,* Our Fathers." Against such a slogan the preacher must protest. God bless our fathers in the Faith. Would that this

generation were worthier of their mantles, nor lightly should their deeds and creeds be set aside. When a man stands ready to demolish all comers, however, with the club of "Baptist usage" he should be opposed with the sword of the Spirit. The living Christ and the living Word are the authorities now and ever shall be, world without end.

In placing the emphasis upon the prophetic side of the preacher's mission it is needful to suggest a word or two by way of caution:

1. Let the preacher guard his spirit, lest he speak in the power of man rather than of the Master.

2. When he knows himself called and authorized to speak for God, let him be courageous. "O man, fear not —be strong, yea, be strong" (Dan. 10: 19). He must not fear the face of man or woman; he must not shrink from poverty and hard places of toil; he must not be afraid of prison or death.

3. He must be a very hopeful man, not clutching faintly, but boldly laying hold of "the larger hope." No prophet was ever a pessimist. Even Jeremiah's sad message closes with the vision of the final triumph of the people of God when Babylon shall be forever destroyed.

4. He must be sympathetic—capable of feeling, to some extent, God's wonderful love and compassion for lost sinners and redeemed saints, and he must love them, too, and make it his chief business to bring God to them and them to God.

5. Then he must be unselfish—not ambitious to win applause; not greedy of filthy lucre; not counting members as success; but caring only to please God and exalt the name of Jesus.

I have tried to set forth the qualifications, the mission, and the attitude of a prophetic ministry. Such a ministry is needed as never before. Such a ministry will be a service of power—consoling, reforming, soul-winning power, would that all the Lord's preachers at least were like Eldad and Medad. Their ministry could never fail.

AN ANABAPTIST LITURGY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, PH. D.

Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier, the author of the following document, was a native of Southern Germany. He was educated in the schools of Augsburg and in the universities of Freiburg and Ingolstadt, where he made a brilliant record as the pupil of John Eck who was afterwards famous as the ablest opponent of Luther. After the conclusion of his studies he became pastor and professor of theology, and for a time pro-rector of the university at Ingolstadt. Thence he was called to be cathedral preacher in the ancient town of Regensburg, and in this prominent position won great applause and influence as an eloquent and effective preacher. After some five years at Regensburg he became pastor at Waldshut and was soon in active correspondence with the leading spirits of south Germany and Switzerland. Careful study of the writings of Luther and of the Scriptures led him to accept the doctrines of the Reformation and to break with the Catholic Church in which such a bright future was opening before him. He was able to carry most of the city with him into the camp of the reformers and it seemed that the reform would be able to plant its feet firmly in the Austrian lands. But towards the end of 1524 he began to cherish Anabaptist views and early the next year openly joined the party. He was now driven from Waldshut. He fled to Zurich where he was arrested and mistreated, but finally allowed to depart. He fled by Constance, Augsburg and Regensburg to Nikolsburg in Moravia where he arrived in July, 1526. Here under the protection of Leonard von Lichtenstein the Anabaptist found peace for a short while, and fugitives from Switzerland

and elsewhere assembled in great numbers. Hubmaier was a trained theologian and writer and soon became the chief literary exponent of the more moderate Anabaptist views. From the peace of this quiet nook he sent out many pamphlets during the remaining brief period of his life, and from them we gain the most pleasing view of Anabaptist doctrines and life.

The following booklet was published in 1527 in order to set forth the doctrines and practices of the Anabaptists at Nikolsburg with regard to the Lord's Supper. It is of importance because it is a full presentation of the practices and belief of the largest, most moderate and intelligent body of Anabaptists that ever gathered in one place.

The text translated is that published by Calvary & Co., of Berlin, in 1869, and it claims to reproduce exactly the original. The German is that of South Germany in the early sixteenth century and in a few places is not without ambiguity, but it is believed that the following translation everywhere reproduces the sense with substantial accuracy.

"A FORM FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY D. BALTHASAR, HUBMÖR VON FRIDBERG.

THE TRUTH IS IMMORTAL, 1527.

A FORM OF THE SUPPER OF CHRIST.

"First—The brethren and sisters who wish to celebrate the table of God according to the institution of Christ should assemble at an appropriate place at a convenient hour in order that there be no division, nor one come early and another late and so miss the evangelical teaching. So the apostles wished when they asked Christ, 'Master where wilt thou that we make ready the paschal lamb?' Thereupon he indicated to them a certain definite place. And Paul writes. 'when ye come together, etc.,' 1 Cor. XI. Then you should provide the table with common

bread and wine. But whether the drinking vessels should be silver, wood or tin is wholly unimportant. However, those who eat should be decourously clothed and should sit by each other with modesty, (Zucht) without frivolity or disputing.

"Second—While at the beginning every one should accuse himself and confess his sins and guilt before God, it is not improper that the priest with the church fall upon their knees first and with heart and mouth repeat the following words:

'Father we have sinned against heaven and against thee. We are not worthy to be called thy children; but speak thou a word of comfort and our souls shall be healed. God be gracious to us sinners. May the almighty, eternal and compassionate God pity us in all our sins and graciously remit them, since he has already forgiven us for them, and lead us without spot or impurity into eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior, Amen!'

"Third—Now let the priest take a seat with the people, open his mouth and explain the Scriptures concerning Christ, that the eyes of those present may be opened, which are still somewhat darkened and closed, so that they can recognize Christ: How he was a prophet mighty in work and teaching before God and all the people, and how the over bishop of the priests and the princes delivered him up to condemnation of death and how they crucified him; how he has redeemed Isræl, that is all believers. Let the priest also reprove the foolish and slow to believe, in all things which Moses and the prophets have spoken (about Christ) in order that he may kindle, make fervent and hot the hearts of those at table; that by earnest reflection on his bitter suffering and death they may be kindled with devotion, love and thanksgiving. Thereupon let the people with their whole heart, soul and power cry to him, "abide with us, O Christ, the evening is coming on and the day is far spent. Abide with us, O Jesus, abide with us; for without thee all is gloom,

night and darkness. But thou art indeed the sun, light, brilliance and glory. He to whom thou givest light can not go astray!"

"At another time let the minister of the word take the 10th or 11th chapter of the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians; or the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th chapters of John. Likewise concerning the changing of the life. Mat. III: Lu. III, concerning the fear of God, Ecclesiastes II, or something else suitable to the time and persons. For in this nobody must be constrained, but every one be left free to exercise his own judgment (in selecting a passage to be read). But let a man use diligence that the Lord's death be earnestly proclaimed, the people be impressed with the surpassing goodness of Christ and the church instructed, built up and influenced with hearty, fervent and brotherly love; so that we can stand before the judgment seat of Christ at the last day with a receiving of our stewardship, and shepherd and sheep may be held togther.

"Fourth—Now after the death of Christ has been proclaimed those present have the right and power to ask questions when they have not fully understood anything, though not in frivolous, useless or inquisitive babbling nor in heavenly things, the almightiness or secrecy of God or pertaining to future things which it would be useless for us to know; but in right, useful and Christian articles touching Christian faith and brotherly love. He then who has a revelation should teach and the first shall remain silent, without any disputing or wrangling, *wan die Kirch hat nit einen branch zekriegen* (meaning is not clear). Let the women remain silent in the congregation, but if they wish to learn anything they should ask their husbands at home that all things may be done in order. 1 Cor., XI:14.

"Fifth—Let the priest take up the words of Paul, 1 Cor. XI, and say therefore, 'let a man prove and remind himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the drink. For whoever eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks to himself the judgment that he does not discern the

Lord's body. And if we thus judged ourselves, we would not be judged by the Lord.'

"But now the remembrance herein contained is as follows:

"First—That the man wholly and certainly believe that Christ has offered and poured out his body and his rose-colored blood for him on the cross in the power of his word as he said, "that is my body which is given for you and that is my blood which is poured out for you for the forgiveness of your sins."

"Second—Let a man prove himself whether he has a true, inward and ardent hunger and thirst after the bread that came down from heaven in which truly man lives, and after the drink that flows into eternal life—to eat and drink both in the spirit, faith and truth as Christ teaches us. John, IV, VI, VII. Where the spiritual eating and drinking does not occur, there the outer breaking of bread, eating and drinking is a killing hypocrisy of the letter and is a food and drink in which one eats judgment and drinks death, as Adam did in eating of the forbidden fruit of the tree in Paradise. Gen. III.

"Third—Let the man prove himself in thankfulness: That with words and works he is thankful toward God for his great, superabundant and unspeakable love and goodness which he has shown him through his best beloved Son and Lord Jesus Christ, especially that he now with the heart gives God praise and thanks. Moreover that he has a mind and will inclined to do for Christ his God and Lord as he (Christ) has done for him. But Christ is not in need of our good deeds, is not hungry, nor thirsty, is neither naked nor in prison, but heaven and earth are his and all that is therein; and so he points us to our neighbors, especially to our fellow-members of the household of faith that we may fulfill on them the work of this thankfulness in a bodily and spiritual way; by feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, comforting those in prison, giving shelter to the suffering. Indeed he will receive this work of pity from us just as if we had done it to himself. Yes, he will

say on the last day 'I was hungry and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me to drink; I was naked, in prison and without shelter and ye have clothed, visited and housed me,' Mat. XXV. He says I, I, I, me, me, me. From that we learn certainly that all which we do to the least of his, we do to Christ himself. Indeed he will not allow a single cool drink of water to go unrewarded, Mat. X. Whoever then is so minded toward his neighbor, he is in the true communion of Christ, a member of his body, and a fellow-member with all saved men.

"Fourth—But in order that the church also may have knowledge of his heart and will, the man now holds communion with her in the breaking of bread in which he gives to her a public testimonial, yes makes for her a sacrament or oath and gives her his plighted troth that henceforth he will offer his body and pour out his blood also for his brethren in the faith. And this he does not of human wantonness as Peter, but in reliance on the grace and power of the suffering and bleeding of our Lord Jesus Christ his own Savior, a living memorial of whose sufferings and death is now made clear to men by the breaking of this bread and the administering of the cup.

"That is the true communion of the saints, which is not a communion because the bread is broken; but where the bread is broken because the communion has preceded and been enclosed in the heart since Christ has come in the flesh. For not all who break the bread are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, which I prove by the traitor Judas. But those who are now in communion inwardly and in spirit, they may also use this bread and wine worthily in an outward way.

"Comparison: we do not believe because we are baptized in water; but on the contrary we were baptized because we had already believed. So says David, 'I have believed, therefore have I spoken.' So says also every Christian, 'I have believed, therefore have I publicly confessed that Jesus is Christ, son of the living God, and then have had myself baptized according to the order of

Christ, the high priest, who lives forever. Likewise I have communion with Christ and all his members; therefore I break the bread with all believing Christian men according to the institution of Christ. Without this inner communion in the spirit and in the truth the external breaking of bread is nothing else than a traitorous and damnable hypocrisy. Even upon this communion and covenant is based the supper of Christ which is a living memorial of his suffering and death for us. Through the breaking of bread and pouring out of the wine it is spiritually testified and shown that each one should also offer his flesh and pour out his blood for the other in like manner. In this will men recognize that we are truly disciples of Christ. Everything which Christ said at the last supper tends to this end. For just as water baptism is a public testimonial of Christian faith, so the supper is a public proclamation of Christian love, whoever then is not willing to be baptized and celebrate the supper, is not willing to be a Christian. Now as much importance for men as is ascribed to the flesh and blood, to the sufferings and death of Christ Jesus, to the pouring out of his rose-colored blood, to the forgiveness of sins, to brotherly love and the communion of God, Father and Son and the Holy Ghost, yes to the communion of all the heavenly auditors (?) (höres) and to the general Christian Church outside of which there is no salvation; just so much importance ought to be ascribed to the bread and wine of the table of God, not that the bread and wine are anything else than bread and wine; but because of the memorial and the significant secrets for which Christ instituted it. If at the present time a man had no other word or Scripture than the right understanding of water baptism and the supper of Christ, still he would have God and all creatures, faith and love, law and all the prophets. Therefore whoever makes sport of the supper of Christ here, of him will the son of man make sport before God and before his angels. So much for the reminding of the man.

"Sixth—Since now this ceremony and sign pertains

wholly to brotherly love, and yet a man who loves his brother as himself is a rare bird, in fact an Indian phœnix now on earth, who can with good conscience take a seat at the supper? Answer. The man who is so minded, so formed in his spirit and heart, inwardly sensible that he truly and from his heart can say, "the love of God which he has proven to me in offering his only begotten and dearly beloved son in payment of my sins as I have heard in his holy word and am certainly assured, has so moved, softened and permeated my spirit and soul, that I also am likewise disposed and willing to offer my flesh and blood, to rule over it and so master it that it must be obedient to me against its own will; further not to take advantage of, deceive or injure my neighbor in any way in body, soul, honor or goods, nor offend his wife or children, but rather for him go into the fire and die and as Paul even desired to be a curse for his brethren and Moses to be rooted out of the book of the living for his people."

Such a man may well take a seat at the supper of Christ with a good conscience and worthiness.

"Dost thou say, 'that is impossible for man to do?' Answer: 'Yes, for the Adamic man.' But all things are possible for Christian men, not as men but as believers who are at one with God and are free and unencumbered by any creature even themselves (with the exception of the flesh.)

When God works out such willing and working in his believers through the inward anointing of the Holy Ghost, the man stands in complete freedom to will and to work good or evil—the good out of the anointing of God, the evil out of his own inborn nature and wantonness. But this evil will may be mastered and tamed by men through the grace of God granted unto them.

It is not enough that the sin is recognized through the law, or even that we know what is good or evil; but we must bind the commands on our garments, seize and fulfill them with the deed. And to do this is easy for the believers, but for the men who walk according to the flesh

all things are impossible. However, the believing and new-born man under the gospel is as much a man as he was before when under the law. He has equally as many temptations as before or even more. He finds also (no matter how holy he is) nothing good in his flesh, just as Saint Paul complains with great earnestness of this strife and opposition of the flesh, still let the believer rejoice and praise God that the temptation in him is not so great nor can be but that the power of God which he has received through his sent and living word, is stronger and mightier. He also knows with certainty that in such temptation the evil desire and sinful lust of his flesh are not damnable, if he confesses the same to God, if he is sorry for them and does not yield to them, but he reigns and rules powerfully over the restless devil of his flesh, chokes him, crucifies and martyrs him without cessation, holds him in with the bridle, does not do his will, cares little if he thereby breaks his neck. Every man who is a Christian acts and does thus, in order that he may worthily eat and drink from the Lord's table.

"Further let ever pious Christian know that to fulfill the law it is not enough to leave off sins and die to them. One must also do good to his neighbor. For Christ not only broke the bread; he also divided it out and gave it to his disciples, nay, not bread only, but also his body and blood. Therefore we must not only speak and hear the word of brotherly love, confess ourselves sinners, and turn away from them; we must also fulfill (them) with works as the Scripture everywhere teaches, 'Leave the evil and do good.' 'Brethren, work out your salvation.' 'While we have time, let us do good, when night comes no man can work.' 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' 'Not the hearers of the law are righteous before God, but those that do the law shall be justified.' 'Also not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that does the will of my father who is in heaven, he will enter into the kingdom of heaven,' says Christ, and adds thereto, 'Every one who hears my words and does them, he is

like a wise man who builds his house upon a rock, but every one who hears my words and does them not is like a fool who builds his house upon the sand.' "

"*Summary.* God wishes to have the will, word and work of brotherly love from us and will not be paid or satisfied with words. But for the native faults and imperfections of the flesh which constantly affect all our actions, he will not condemn us to eternal damnation because of the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, since in Christ we have reached completeness and in him we are already saved. What more do we lack?

"Seventh—Since now the men are inwardly and wholly devoted to their fellow-members with honor, goods, body and life, even to the stretching their souls into hell for them with the help of God; hereupon it is indeed necessary again heartily to groan and pray to God that he would increase the faith of these new men, also to kindle in them the fire of brotherly love still better; so that they may increase more and more, grow up and persevere until the end in those two articles signified by water baptism and the supper. Here there should be a common silence in order that every one who wishes to come to the table of God may meditate upon the sufferings of Christ and so therein rest with Saint John upon the Lord's breast. After this silence the Lord's prayer is repeated by the church with devotion and with hearts that desire grace.

"'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen..'

"Eighth—Let the priest carefully explain that here bread is bread and wine is wine and not flesh and blood as men have for a long time believed.

Whoever would eat of this bread and drink of this drink of the supper, let him stand up and repeat with heart and mouth the following covenant:

THE COVENANT. (Liebepflicht.)

"Brethren and sisters, will you love God in the power of his holy and living word, before, in and above all things, serve, honor and pray to him alone and henceforth follow his name; (will you) also subject your fleshly and sinful will to his divine will which he has worked in you through his living word, for life and death? Let each one separately say, I WILL. Will you love your neighbor and fulfill on him the works of brotherly love, offer your flesh and pour out your blood for him? (will you) be obedient to father, mother and all magistracy according to the will of God, and this in the power of our Lord Jesus Christ who also offered his flesh and poured out his blood for us? Let us each one separately say, I WILL, will you use brotherly chastisement (straff) toward your brethren and sisters, make peace and harmony between them, also reconcile yourself with all those who have offended you, drop envy, hate and all evil will toward any; willingly desist from all actions and dealings which injure, damage or vex your neighbor, also love your enemies and do good to them; (and will you), exclude (from the church) all those who are not willing so to do according to the order of Christ. Mat. XVIII, c. Let each one separately say I WILL. Do you desire hereon in the supper of Christ by the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine to confirm publicly before the church this covenant which you have just now made and to testify to the power of the living memorial of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ our Lord? Let each one separately say, 'I DESIRE it in the power of God.'

"Therefore eat and drink with one another in the name of God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. May he give us all power and strength that we spend the time according to his holy will (and) worthy of salvation. The Lord communicate to us his grace. Amen.

"Ninth—The bishop takes the bread and lifts his eyes to heaven with the church, praises God and says, 'we praise and thank thee O Lord God, creator of heaven and

earth for all the goodness which thou hast done to us, especially that thou hast loved us so heartily that thou hast given thy well beloved son to die for us so that every one who believes in him should not be lost but have eternal life. Thou art praised, honored and exalted now, ever, always and into eternity. Amen.'

"Now the priest takes the bread, breaks it and offers it to those present in their hands and says:

"THE LORD JESUS IN THE

night when he was betrayed took the bread, gave thanks and broke it and said, 'take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of me.' "

"So take and eat also, dear brethren and sisters, the bread in memory of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he has given to us even unto death. When every one has eaten, the priest also takes the cup, with the wine and with his eyes raised (to heaven) says, 'Praise be unto God!' and offers it to them in their hands and says:

"IN LIKE MANNER TOOK

the Lord Jesus the cup also after the supper and said 'this cup is a new testament in my blood; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' So take ye also the cup and drink of it all in remebrance of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was poured out for us, for the forgiveness of our sins.'

WHEN THEY HAVE ALL DRUNK THE PRIEST SAYS,

"As oft as ye eat the bread and drink the drink, ye should proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

NOW THE CHURCH TAKE A SEAT TOGETHER TO HEAR THE CONCLUSION.

Tenth—Dearest brethren and sisters in the Lord, as we have now celebrated a communion with one another through this eating of bread and drinking of drink in memory of the suffering and shedding of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of our sins and have

all become one bread and one body and our bread is Christ, so we ought to become like our head and follow him like members, love one another and do good, be honest and helpful and offer for one another our flesh and blood. We should also live, speak and act honorably and chastely under our head Christ, that we give no man offense or occasion of stumbling and those who are without may not have occasion to revile our head, faith and church and say, 'does your head Christ teach you such evil living, is that your faith, is that your baptism, is that your Christian church supper and gospel that you should lead such a godless and shameful life in overeating, drinking, gambling, dancing, charging usury, slandering; in scolding, cursing, blaspheming; in haughtiness, covetousness, envy, hate and anger, in all unchastity, luxury, laziness and frivolity, woe, woe to him who gives offense. It were better for him that some one hang a millstone about his neck and cast him into the depth of the sea. But let us take upon us a pious, honorable and earnest life that thereby God our Father who is in heaven may be praised.

"But since brotherly love always demands that one member of the body have a care also for the other, it is, therefore, the earnest command of Christ that where one brother sees another erring or sinning that he rebuke him once and twice out of brotherly love. But if he will not mend his ways nor desist from his sins, cite him before the church. When then the third time the church warns him, if that does no good, let her exclude him from her membership. If it is a case where the sin is public and aggravated the man should be punished publicly and before all men in order that others may have fear.

"Therefore I beg and warn you once again, my dearly beloved in Christ, that henceforth as Christ's table companions you lead a Christian walk before God and before men. Be mindful of your baptismal vow and covenant which you in receiving the water and breaking the bread have publicly and clearly made with God and the church. Be careful that you bring forth fruits worthy of baptism and the supper of Christ in order that you may in the

power of God satisfy your vow, promise, sacrament and sworn duty (aydspflicht). God sees it and knows your hearts. Our Lord Jesus Christ, ever and eternally praised, grant us this. Amen. Dear brethren and sisters, watch and pray that you do not deviate nor fall into temptation. You know neither the day nor the hour when the Lord comes and demands from you a reckoning of your life; therefore watch and pray, God be with you. Let every one among you say in himself, 'Praise, praise to the Lord forever. Amen! Arise and go in the peace of the Lord Jesus. The grace of God be with us all. Amen.'

"THE TRUTH IS IMMORTAL.

TO THE NOBLE LORD, LORD BURIAN VON CARNITZ, MY GRACIOUS LORD.

"Grace and peace in Christ, noble and Christian Sir. Although the majority of the people who are attached to the gospel recognize that bread is bread and wine is wine in the supper of Christ, and are not Christ, since himself has ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God his Father whence he will come again to judge the living and the dead, exactly this is our bed rock according to which we must rightly understand and expound all Scriptures bearing on food and drink, namely, that Christ is not eaten and drunken by us otherwise than spiritually and in faith; also that he is not corporeally (leiblich) the bread, but in the memory as he himself and Paul have explained these Scriptures. Whoever understands them otherwise does violence to the articles of our Christian faith. Nevertheless the restless Satan has thought out another trick in order to hold us in his halter, namely, that men should set up the supper without any preceding baptism, which again the Scripture will not allow. When the three thousand men and Paul were instructed in the word and believed, then for the first time they broke bread with the brethren. For as faith precedes love, so water baptism goes before the supper. However, in order that your grace may know in what form the supper is celebrated at Nicolspurg (Nikolsburg),

I have had this published to the praise of God, to the honor of your grace and for the welfare of all Christian believers, in order that nobody may think that we shun the light or are unable to bring forward ground for our teaching and actions. God be with your grace, may he receive with favor this dedication through my beloved brother, Jan Zeysinger. Your grace.

Willingly (williger), Balthasar Huebmör, etc."

A few remarks in conclusion, may not be amiss.

First—The author of this "Form" had for many years been a faithful priest of the Catholic Church, and yet there is not a trace of its doctrines and scarcely an echo of its liturgy. He had evidently broken completely with the old church.

Second—This "Form" permitted large freedom and discretion to the administrator. It was evidently intended to be suggestive and helpful rather than imperative. The aim was to impress the participants with the exceeding richness of God's love and grace as shown in the death of Christ as well as with their own profound obligation to lead a sober and righteous life.

Third—The words "priest" and "bishop" are applied to the administrator, apparently with reference to the same person. But too little is known of the details of the Anabaptist organization at Nikolsburg as elsewhere to affirm with certainty that this is the case. "Priest" is, of course, used like the ancient "presbyter" without reference to any official priestly character.

Fourth—The view of the supper seems to waver between that of Zwingli and that of Calvin, but since the latter had not yet been fully developed, the language is probably only a loose statement of the Zwinglian view. The supper must be preceded by baptism which makes them the predecessors of the Baptist practice of "close communion."

Fifth—In view of the frequent charge that the Anabaptists opposed magistracy it is interesting to find a solemn promise of obedience to magistrates along with

obedience to parents in the covenant repeated before the supper.

Sixth—In general it is important to note the strong emphasis laid upon the duty of leading righteous and actively helpful lives. It is impossible to believe that such earnest teaching remained unfruitful in the lives of its hearers.

SCHILLER AND HIS INFLUENCE ON GERMAN LIFE.

BY A. VINCENT DYE, PH.D., WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE.

On the ninth of last May was celebrated the hundredth anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friederich Schiller, poet, dramatist, philosopher and historian. In nearly all of the universities and in many of our colleges and high schools special exercises were held in honor of this man. And, not only in learned circles, but also among the common people, wherever Germans were gathered together—in Shanghai, Tokio, South Africa, Chicago, no matter where—there was a sign given that Schiller and his work were not forgotten. In the cantons of the Swiss Republic, the government presented every school child with a copy of Wilhelm Tell. On the boards of practically every theater in Germany one of his dramas was performed. There were orations, poems, unveiling of monuments and processions everywhere; in fact quite a glare of brilliant festivities in honor of the tall, fair-haired German who died quietly on that rickety, old bed down in Weimar. But after "the tumult and the shouting dies," and the smoke of so much incense has rolled away, we who read and enjoy Schiller may be able to see more clearly what Schiller's life means to Germany and to the world.

To those who have recently made the pilgrimage to the Schiller house in Weimar it may have seemed a bit incongruous, that in one of the two little rooms where Schiller's last days on earth were spent, there should hang a large picture of "Honest Abe" Lincoln. If there be any explanation for this, it probably is, that both sprang from common stock, and by their own efforts forced their way to the top without becoming embittered or overbearing. Schiller was born at the little village of Marbach, November 10, 1759. On his father's side he

could point back to several generations of bakers and his mother was the daughter of an innkeeper. But his parents were honest people, rich in virtue, though with little ready money. The child, Friederich, was not very strong and had spasms and other childish ailments which he outgrew. Later he went to school and had boyish aspirations to be a preacher.

Until thirteen years of age he lived a quiet, free life; and then, because he was somewhat brighter than his fellows, he was to lose this freedom and be shut up in a military academy. Here he was subjected to rigid discipline, taught to be servile and fawn on nobility. Karl Eugen, Duke of Wurtemberg, whose life had been spent in dissipation, decided to follow a fad of his day and founded a military academy, which he compelled every boy of promise, that he could find in his dukedom, to attend. Schiller was one of these boys. The discipline was severe, a cringing, tattling spirit pervaded the institution and the boys were under the necessity of writing eulogies of Karl Eugen and his mistress. Schiller did his share of this disagreeable business, because he could do nothing else. A poor boy of fifteen in a military school could not overthrow a dukedom. Indeed, the test of his inborn strength of character lies in the fact that eight years of this training did not crush his spirit, but the constant suppression only awakened in him a longing for freedom that became the keynote of his life.

In school he first decided to study jurisprudence, then changed to medicine, and disliked both callings very heartily. In his studies he was neither very good nor very bad, and read whatever he could find in the way of literature. The things that appealed to him were the sonorous, lofty odes of Klopstock and his Messiah, the gloomy, shadowy heroes of Ossian and Gerstenberg's Ugolino. He began to write. He wrote some things and tore them up, but by the time he was twenty-two he had one thing finished and ready for the public. This was a drama, we need not be surprised that it was a drama full of horror, blood and thunder, a revolt against law and

against society, a plea for freedom of individual action, having a characteristic title, *The Robbers.* He managed to have it put on the stage at Mannheim, and played truant in order to go and see it. When he came home, this twenty-two-year-old man was scolded like a school-boy, and afterward told he must write no more or he would be shut up in the guard-house.

There was but one thing left for him to do. He and his friend Streicher ran away. Schiller had but little money; so he went hungry and might have starved had not Streicher made his resources common property. He was now in the world to make his way. He had definitely committed himself to literature, having no other source of income and trying to secure none. Art demands the whole man, and he worked at it with feverish haste. Within a year he had finished another drama, *Fiesco.* We need not follow all his struggles. He tried this and that literary expedient to support himself. He had malaria, wrote love lyrics to a widow, with whom he boarded, founded a literary journal that didn't pay and turned out another drama. With this third drama, *Intrigue and Love,* he had rounded off within five years the first period in his development as an artist.

As in his life, the keynote in these works is freedom. But what kind of freedom is it? Evidently, in all of them freedom of the individual from outside restraint, freedom to develope himself unhampered by the conventions of society or the tyrannical law of absolute despotism. In each of these plays the hero is a man oppressed by the false arrangements of civilization, who demands for himself the right to be happy in his own way. The ideas are democratic, revolutionary. They are an echo of Rousseau's cry "Back to Nature." There is no self-restraint in them, but there is this elemental force, namely, that they appeal to all men who feel that they are ground down and who are in such a fever of revolt that they will resort to desperate measures to get their hands free. They appeal precisely to those passions that are seething among the lower classes of Russia to-day.

Schiller had secured a place as director of the theater at Mannheim but toward the close of 1784 he left there in debt, disappointed and discredited. He had several miserable months to endure before he went to live with Gottfried Korner at Dresden. There two years were spent under the influence of this kind but strong spirit. The turbid, troubled current of his life was beginning to run itself clear, and the drama *Don Carlos,* marks the beginning of a new period in his life. The theme is still the same, the freedom of the individual, but the old "storm and stress" period is passing away and a larger humanism taking its place. He begins to perceive that the real problem of life is far more complex than that of corporal freedom. His searching after historical personages to use as characters for his dramas led him to purely historical studies. These, in turn, led to a broader perspective and a deeper insight into the significance of political movements. He turned his attention also to philosophy following the leading ideas of Kant.

In 1787 Schiller went to Weimar and henceforth his life was to be associated with its literary coterie. His historical studies bore fruit in *The Revolt of the Netherlands* and later in the *History of the Thirty Years' War.* As a result of the favorable reception of the former work he was elected to a professorship of history in the University of Jena. This brought him reputation and prestige, but little money. February 22, 1790, he married Charlotte von Lengefeld. The same winter he fell seriously ill, recovered to some extent and had a bad relapse the next summer. In fact for the next fifteen years his life was one long struggle with disease that gradually wore him out. Added to this was the ancient curse of poets, debt, and the necessity of providing for a growing family. He worked desperately to produce literature that would sell, but the wolf still kept close to the door. He might have broken down with utter despair, had not the Danish poet Baggesen influenced the Dane, Count Schimmelmann and the Duke of Austenberg to grant him a pension of one thousand thalers a year for three years,

and do it so delicately that Schiller could not refuse.

These then, disease and poverty, were the evils of his mature life; the furies with scourges forever behind him, lest he should sink into calm enjoyment of life. But as the artistic nature least of all goes willingly under whip and spur, he must have had some compensation to lure him on. This compensation, the brightness of his life, consisted in the friendship of good men and of strong men, in domestic happiness, in his literary co-operation with Goethe and, last but not least, in the joy of artistic creation; all in all perhaps more than enough to balance the ills.

At Weimar Schiller not only continued his study of philosophy and history, but also turned his attention to the study of the classic Greek writers. In his study of the Thirty Years' War Schiller had gathered the material for his next great drama, *Wallenstein.* The treatment of this material is influenced by the idea of fatalism drawn from Greek tragedy. In this drama man is not entirely free. He is not the calm, ready pilot standing at the helm of his own destiny, but his weal or woe depends on fate with calmness. The same idea appears faintly in *Mary Stuart,* being here partly replaced by the sense of poetic justice. In the *Maid of Orleans* the fatalistic idea dominates most strongly of all.

In Schiller's last and greatest work the idea of fate is laid aside and the theme is once more that of freedom. It is noteworthy that in this last drama he should come back to the theme of his first. But what a difference in the conception of freedom in *The Robbers* and in *Wilhelm Tell.* In the latter it is not the selfish liberty of the individual, but the freedom of a whole people, not the anarchy of the French Revolution but the unity of a republican form of government. And not only in his dramas but in his historical and æsthetical writings he shows that he no longer believes the "back-to-nature" theory. He sees that men can not go back, that if salvation is anywhere it is on ahead. And he believed that men were working out their emancipation. He believed it a part

of the plan of God that men should move on to a state of freedom—from the dominance of the senses to the dominance of the instinct of duty.

It is this idea of freedom that Schiller has left as his largest legacy to the German people. He left much besides, beautiful harmony, sublime sentiments and all the charm that great artists have; but this idea is the one that has endeared him most among his fellow men. It follows as a natural consequence that this element in Schiller's poetry should be most effective in the nation whenever the people were oppressed. For the element of force in all his writings is not the calm, powerful revelation of a soul that sits in peace after having fought and won, but the nobility of soul that makes a man dissatisfied and inspires him to press onward to a more lofty goal. This is why, possibly, so many Germans say Schiller is the poet for youth but not for old age; why probably so many *blasé* young men in the universities affect to think little of Schiller. For Schiller demands enthusiasm; enthusiasm is apt to be unscientific, and the model university student of to-day is the embodiment of the "passionless pursuit of a passionless intelligence." In fact, not only in Germany but in our own country the study of all literature threatens to be swallowed up in philology which is the apotheosis of the material side of it. So we shall not find the influence of Schiller working through the lives of the university men.

For the same reason we shall not find Schiller in high favor with the smug, self-satisfied classes who are on top to-day and who wish things to stay just as they are. These may enjoy his dramatic art and his love lyrics but they will not take him seriously. He will not move them to do anything. The people with whom Schiller's poetry is a living force are those who are ground down by bureaucracy and militarism. He appeals also to those unselfish spirits who are themselves in good circumstances but who are trying to bring about social and political reforms.

Historically, Schiller's influence can be traced theoretically much better than practically. During his lifetime

his writings with their ideal of the free man made a part of the leaven that was working among the German people and aroused them for the struggle with Napoleon. Schiller had died before the decisive period came, after having helped to plant the ideal in the minds of his countrymen. During the struggle the war poets like Arndt, Korner, Fouque, Gleist, Schenkendorf and others inspired the people with martial songs in the same strain. The battles were fought and won; then came the reaction. The outside enemies were overcome, but internal strife and petty jealousy made the nation sink back into the old submission to unworthy princes. Once more it was left to the poets and thinkers to keep alive the ideal expressed in Wilhelm Tell of freedom and unity.

But just as in the individual there are times when the ideal dominates the practical, so in the life of nations there are epochs when idealism is the spirit of the times. At such times the people become dissatisfied with their rulers. Old relations are broken up. Experiments are tried in government, in art, in religion. Class distinctions are wiped out. In art the bizarre, the extravagant is popular. During such periods in German history Schiller's work has struck the keynote of true progress. There were the fermentation periods of 1830 and 1848. During all this time the nation was forming new ideals Schiller's works had become classics to be read iu the school-room by boys who grew into men and carried with them into commerce, religion and government the ideals gained in youth. It is probable that these men when they were older seldom read Schiller just as we seldom read our great poets after leaving academic life. Just as certainly, however, the influence has been exerted upon the life of the mature man through the impressions gained in youth. This is the influence exerted by great poets everywhere and Schiller is no exception. How great this influence is can not be measured. It is working even today.

Indeed, the American who has seen recently some of Schiller's plays performed in Germany may have been

at a loss to account for the marked applause from the cheaper seats which greeted some lines on freedom that seemed to him rather common-place. But after living there awhile, he has come to a realization of the fact that, as an American, he had been born and reared in perfect freedom, until it had become an accepted and common blssing just like pure air and water, something, certainly, to be thankful for, but not calling for any special oratory. With him the thing had been attained and enjoyed and little enthusiasm was to be kindled; over yonder it is in some respects still an ideal and as such capable of appealing to the heart. And until this ideal of perfect freedom be attained Schiller's influence in Germany will be vital and creative.

SOME STUDIES IN EXEGESIS.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

BY E. J. FORRESTER, D. D.

The task here undertaken is an exposition of Jno. 3: 5; Acts 2: 38, and 1 Pet. 3: 21, as bearing upon the subject of baptismal regeneration. The task involves the following particulars, to-wit: (1) To discover the thought in the mind of the author of each one of the passages; (2) To collate these thoughts; (3) To formulate the doctrine of salvation that is taught.

I. Jno. 3: 5: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

The difficulty in this passage is created by the word "water." What did Jesus mean by introducing that word?

Observe (1) that his language, literally rendered, is not "born of water and the Spirit," but "born of water and Spirit." "Water and "Spirit" are put in the most general way, and are linked in closest union.

Observe (2) that this expression "water and Spirit" is equivalent to the expression "anew" in v. 3. "Born of water and Spirit" is equivalent to "born anew," "born from above," or "born again." The birth described in v. 3 by ἄνωθεν, and thus clearly shown to be different from the natural one, is described in v. 5 as a birth ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνευματος.

Does this close union of these two words "water" and "Spirit" indicate that they are to be taken together to represent one idea? Certainly not so in the sense that one of the words would just as fully express the idea as both of them. But, on the other hand, they are to be taken together to represent a double aspect of the single condition of "entrance into the Kingdom of God." That

single condition is a spiritual one. It is spiritual and only spiritual, as is indicated by the fact that Jesus drops the word "water" in verses 6 and 8, and uses only the word "Spirit" in connection with the new birth of which he is speaking, and as is further and abundantly shown throughout the New Testament. The double aspect of the one spiritual condition is seen in the "Spirit" as the agent who effects that condition, and in the "water" as the element in which a natural cleansing is effected that symbolizes the condition effected by the "Spirit." The ground-idea is change. The change is like the one that is effected in the natural world by the cleansing power of water. Here the change is effected by "Spirit." Because it is a change effected by "Spirit," and is like the change effected by water, Jesus describes it as a change, or birth of "water and Spirit."

If this interpretation is correct, it must be one which our Lord's auditor *might* have understood, though he really did not understand. Jesus would speak to him in language that ought to be intelligible to him.

Does the interpretation meet that test? Why should Nicodemus *not* understand this language as it has been interpreted?

(1) He was familiar with the Jewish purifications by water, and with the many Scripture expressions which made the external washing a symbol of spiritual cleansing.

(2) He was familiar with a great movement among his people just lately begun by the preaching of John. He knew that John had been crying, "Repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." He also knew that those who repented were baptized by John in Jordan, their baptism symbolizing the change of soul which they had undergone.

Living in that thought-atmosphere, Nicodemus ought not to have found it hard to understand what Jesus meant by being "born of water."

Further, Nicodemus must have known that John connected his own work with one who would come after—one

upon whom the Spirit of God descended as a dove at the Jordan, and who would baptize with the Holy Spirit. As John used water to symbolize the spiritual change of repentance, so the Coming One would give the Spirit as the agent effecting spiritual change.

In Luke 7: 29, 30, we read: "All the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him."

Nicodemus belonged to that class who has thus "rejected the counsel of God;" and, in the light of what has been said so far, we may paraphrase the words ofJesus to him as follows: "If you are to enter the Kingdom of God, you must not rely upon Israelitish birth, as I clearly see you are now doing. Something else is necessary. There is a "counsel of God" for you which you must accept. John has shown it to you. He has called you to repentance, symbolizing that spiritual change by baptizing in water those who accepted his message of repentance; and he has proclaimed a baptism of the Spirit by me. This is God's "counsel" for you. To accept this counsel—so to come into harmony with him—is to be born anew; and, unless you are thus born anew, you cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

Thus it will be seen that the specific thought here is that Nicodemus and all of his kind must understand that no sort of relations into which natural birth had placed them would avail to put them into the Messianic Kingdom; that changed relations were as imperatively needed by them as by the Gentiles, and that the change in relations required was spiritual, wrought by the Spirit of God, acquiesced in, accepted by the subject, and symbolized by cleansing in water.

It will be observed that Jesus did not once mention baptism in this conversation with Nicodemus; and that, according to the exegesis, there is either no allusion to baptism, or the most indirect allusion to it as a symbol.

2. Acts 2: 38: "And Peter said unto them, "Repent

ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

The question here is whether baptism is made a condition of the forgiveness of sins:

It is beyond dispute that the clause ,"Unto the remission of your sins" expresses design. Does that expression of design link itself to the exhortation to repent alone? or to the exhortation to be baptized alone; or to both exhortations as one?

(1) Not to the exhortation to repent alone. That would be grammatically inadmissible.

(2) Not to the exhortation to be baptized alone. That would be grammatically possible, but forbidden by plain teaching of the New Testament, e. g., the answer of Paul and Silas to the question of the Philippian jailor. They said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

(3) Not to both exhortations as one. That would be grammatically admissible; but the clear teaching of the New Testament lodges the same objection against this as against the connection first disposed of.

How, then, shall we understand this design? We must look at the circumstances, and try to penetrate the psychological position of the speaker.

He had been telling his hearers how they, through wicked men, had crucified their Messiah. They were cut to the heart. There was deep conviction of sin. They wanted forgiveness. That was the one great object now before their out-reaching desire; to obtain it was the one great purpose with which they were willing to put forth any effort. They appealed for direction. They cried out: "Brethren, what shall we do?" Peter, laying stress of mind upon what they should *do,* answered that they must repent and be baptized. In his mind, baptism came next to repentance, and should closely follow it. With him, the first thing was to repent, and the next was to be baptized. To people convicted of sin, and reaching out after forgiveness, and wanting to know what

to do—to such people he would say: "Repent and be baptized."

I take it, then, that he was not laying down the very lowest terms required for remission of sins, but was telling these people what people in their state of mind ought to do. The stress was not on what was necessary to get what they then most wanted, but was upon what people aroused as they were should proceed at once to do.

It is worthy of remark that Peter told his hearers that they would receive the Holy Spirit after their baptism, while in the case of Cornelius (Acts 10: 47), he used the previous reception of the Holy Spirit as a reason why baptism should not be withheld.

3. 1 Pet. 3: 21: "Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Here Peter distinctly says that baptism saves. But, when that statement is made, the whole truth as to what he says lacks much of being expressed.

(1) He says that, in its saving, baptism is antitypical.

(2) He says that, in its saving, baptism is an antitype of the water of the Deluge.

(3) He says that, in its saving, baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,but it is the interrogation of a good conscience toward God.

He had said (v. 20) that eight lives had been brought, into the Ark and through water, to safety.

The question, then, is: How can the water of baptism be placed alongside of the water of the Deluge as antitype is placed alongside of type? The answer is: A safety was reached by Noah and his family after passing through the water of the Deluge, so salvation is reached by the sinner after passing through the water of baptism.

But does Peter mean to say that a sinner must pass through the water of baptism to reach salvation, and that if he does pass through, he will surely be saved? It might have seemed that such was his meaning, if he had

stopped at saying that baptism was the antitype of the Deluge. He, however, did not stop there. On the contrary, he went on to describe baptism in such language as to show that he had in mind its spiritual import. He describes it first negatively, and then positively. Negatively, it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." So far from viewing it merely as an external ceremony, performed in a material element, he does not look at it even as a moral reformation. Positively, it is "the interrogation of a good conscience toward God."

"The interrogation of a good conscience toward God" —what is the meaning of that as a description of baptism? Baptism stands for and represents that spiritual attitude of the sinner which, in an interview, an interrogation, an examination, sincerely accepts what God offers, and sincerely engages to do what he requires.

We come, then, to Peter's idea in this form: As Noah and his family passed to safety through the water of the Deluge, so sinners pass to salvation through the spiritual experience represented, symbolized by baptism.

II. To collate the thoughts discovered.

The three passages examined set before us three distinct psychological positions.

1. In the first, Jesus is the speaker, and a Jewish Rabbi is the auditor. The Rabbi thinks that he and his kind, by reason of natural birth, are entitled to membership in the Messianic Kingdom. Here is a new and remarkable teacher risen among them. The Rabbi goes to see what he can learn about this new teacher, and from him. The words of praise with which he introduces the interview are responded to by Jesus with a sentence which strikes at the root of the fatal error in his mind. The purpose of Jesus is to show Nicodemus that a spiritual birth is necessary to membership in the Kingdom of Messiah, no matter what the natural birth may have been. This necessary birth is effected by Spirit, and is, in the realm of Spirit, like that change which, in the realm of Nature, is effected by the cleansing virtue of water.

2. In the second passage, Peter is delivering an im-

passioned address. Deep conviction is produced in the souls of his hearers. They cry out: "What shall we do?" The answer comes quick and warm: "Repent and be baptized." They want to get rid of their sins, and want to know what they must do. He pays special attention to what people in their situation should do. They should at once repent and be baptized. He does not stop to tell them that baptism, in particular, is not necessary to forgiveness, but that repentance is. He tells them what they ought at once to do; and, in telling them that, he tells them enough for salvation—not necessarily only enough, but enough, and more than enough, as is shown by other Scriptures.

3. In the third passage, Peter is writing a letter. He is urging the suffering of Christ as a reason why those to whom he writes, should endure hardship nobly. From this main thought, he makes a digression. In the course of that digression, quite incidentally, he places the Deluge and Baptism alongside of each other as type and antitype, making Baptism to represent that of which, in the Apostolic mind, it had become the standing smybol, viz.: A certain spiritual attitude necessary for salvation.

III. To formulate the doctrine of salvation taught.

The doctrine of salvation that emerges from the investigation is this: The one solitary condition of the remission of sins, or justification, is a spiritual attitude which sincerely accepts God's offer of grace in Christ, and sincerely engages to do what he requires—an attitude which is reached through a spiritual change that is fitly represented in Baptism as a death to sin, and an attitude which looks to the future with a purity of purpose that is fitly represented in Baptism as a resurrection to a new life.

The symbolic relation of Baptism to this attitude is such that, while Baptism may be described as an act of obedience on the part of the saved, it should be remembered that it is an act which, in the Apostolic mind, held a foremost position of significance, importance and obligation.

A NOTE ON JOHN 1: 29, 35.

BY A. J. DICKINSON, M.A., D.D.

"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

This saying of the Baptist is freighted with theological meaning probably above any other formula of the ages. It is one which we would expect to result from long reflection and interpretation of the facts in the career of Jesus. It is possibly the best summary of the mission of the Messiah we have. And yet here it is at the very beginning of our Lord's messianic ministry before he has wrought or taught anything concerning himself or his mission. Who in all the world knew as yet that Jesus would die and that death was the road to messianic glory? Who knew that his death would be sacrificial as an offering of God? Who knew that thus he would atone for and take away sins? Who knew that this salvation was for all the world? Are not all these ideas the products of speculative and reflective theologizings upon the facts as made known in the death and life of Jesus? And yet here it is, a *theologoumenon,* an epitome of the meaning of the messianic mission of Jesus, used by the forerunner to introduce him to his disciples as the Messiah. It is an interpretation of the meaning of his life before any one had as yet known the facts which would convey that meaning. Besides the Synoptics seem clearly to teach that Jesus reserved teaching his messianic death until after the crisis at Cæsarea Philippi. "From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples that he must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief-priests and scribes and be killed and the third day be raised up." (Mt. 16: 21). And the disciples could not believe this, but would have it be far from their Lord. Did the Baptist, with his meager intercourse with Jesus, know more of his messianic destiny than Peter, John and James after more than two years of intimate discipleship? And yet this saying of the Baptist implies not only the death of Jesus as the Messiah but also the Pauline

interpretation thereof. This situation has led exegetical critics to suggest several explanations of this seeming anomaly.

First—It has been held that these are not the words of the Baptist but a *theologoumenon* of the close of the first century of Christianity put into the mouth of the Forerunner by the evangelist. (Wendt's *Teachings of* Jesus, vol. ii., pp. 261f.) This opinion is widely held among critics and rests on the facts (1) that this evangelist is accustomed to intersperse his own *theologoumena* in his narrative (see 3: 16-21; 4: 31-36, &c.); (2) the author, who is also the writer of the First Epistle, does report the discourses of Jesus in his own vocabulary and style, and is not careful to reproduce the exact words of the Lord; (3) his purpose being to give, not a narrative report of the deeds and words of Jesus, but an interpretation of his life as the life-giving Messiah to those who receive him and believe on him (20: 31), does not bind to a verbatim report of sayings. So he gives the Baptist's language, not in the words of the Forerunner, but in his own interpretation of them after sixty years of Christian experience and in the full effect of their meaning as extended through just inference under added light. In putting this *theologoumenon* of Asian theology at the close of the first century into the mouth of the Baptist he makes him speak, not in his identical words, but in words which have come with the fuller content of meaning after years of interpretation of those very words. This he does because he is writing as an interpreter and not as a reporter, and is giving testimony, not as to his language, but as to his meaning. So, if one would get at the exact language of the Baptist, he must read out of this passage the Johannine *theologoumena* of propitiation through death for the sins of the world. (See I. John 2: 2.)

But, if we trim these words of all that might be attributed to the padding of the evangelist, will there be any residue left to the Baptist?

Second—Weiss thinks "the Lamb of God" belongs to

the Baptist, and the explanation, "that taketh away the sin of the world," belongs to the evangelist. (See *Biblical Theology,* vol. II., p. 359.) But this by no means removes the part of the saying which has been considered so incongruous with its setting. If John knew Jesus as the lamb of God, he must also have known of his sacrificial death and its atoning efficacy. Nor does the reference to Isaiah 53 lessen the weight of the words. Either we have here a *theologoumenon* of the evangelist, or a saying of the Baptist. The language of the book says distinctly it is the latter, but the style seems to be the former, and any effort to make it a combination of both is arbitrary and excused only by the direst exegetical extremity.

Third—But this terse epigrammatic yet pregnant expression need not be classed as a *theologoumenon* to account for its literary features. Oracles are also characterized by these same stylistic marks. May it not have been an oracle which the Baptist had received? The probability of this explanation of the saying in this context being the true one depends very greatly upon whether a place may there be found for such an oracle. That the Baptist did receive an oracle which he has not given in full words is distinctly stated in this content, viz: "He that sent me to baptize in water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever than shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him the same is he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit" (v. 2, 33). It is true there is nothing here cited which would account for the passage under discussion. But it was not requisite to the author's purpose to quote all of the oracle at this point, and it may have contained much more than is here quoted. It would be expected that, if he was given the sign by which to recognize the Messiah, he would also have been given some statement of the purpose of that Messiah's mission. The verse clearly proves that the Baptist did receive oracles from God about the Messiah. Let us consider this context to see if there be no place in it for such an oracle. Jesus came to John when he was baptizing with a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. Did Jesus make no

confession at that baptism? If so, must it not have been an unusual confession to have so moved John to hinder him for the reason that he rather had need to be baptized of Jesus? Suppose now that Jesus came confessing the sins of the world, and we have just such a situation accounted for. Then follows the Lord's answer that it was fitting thus to fulfill all righteousness, and the baptism takes place. As he comes up out of the water the heavens are opened, the Spirit descends as a dove and abides on him and the *Bath Qol* is heard, "This is my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased." The Spirit now resident in him drives him into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, where he abides forty days in contemplation and reflection on his new-found messianic mission. (See an article on *"The Autobiography of Jesus,"* in *Journal of Theology* for July, 1898, by Prof. B. W. Bacon). In this temptation as expounded in this article he consecrates himself to a messianic mission that is spiritual, redemptive and sacrificial. Then he returns and is publicly heralded by the Baptist as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." In a time when oracles from heaven concerning the advent of the Messiah were being received and the *Bath Qol* being heard, it is quite natural that this saying also which no earthly condition can reasonably account for may also have come from heaven, and the forerunner was the recipient, not only of a revelation as to the sign by which the Messiah might be identified, but also of a formula by which he might be publicly introduced with a forecast of his messianic mission to those who would receive him. This explanation does not require that the Baptist should know the full meaning of the words he spoke, much less his disciples whom Jesus found it necessary two years later to show how he must suffer and be killed and the third day be raised up. If, as Prof. Bacon shows in the article above referred to, Jesus reserved the experience of his temptation until this time in his ministry before teaching it to his disciples, he may well also and for the same reason have reserved teaching the content of this oracle.

It seems in every way better to construe the *logion* as an oracle revealed to the Baptist, rather than as a *theologoumenon* of the closing decade of the first century of Christianity put into the mouth of the Forerunner by the evangelist.

HARMONY OF MAT. 8: 5-13 AND LUKE 7: 1-10.

BY REV. A. E. THOMSON.

I. The Apparent Discrepancies.

These all lie in the fact that, according to Matthew, the centurion meets Jesus and makes his plea and enters his protest in person, while, according to Luke, he does it through others, sending two deputations to Jesus. Thus;

(*a*) "There came unto him a centurion, beseeching him." (Mat.).

"He sent unto him the elders of the Jews." (Luke).

(*b*) "And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him." (Mat.).

"Then Jesus went with them." (Luke.)

(*c*) "The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy, etc." (Mat.).

"The centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, etc." (Luke).

(*d*) "And Jesus said unto the centurion, go thy way, etc. (Mat.).

"And they that were sent returned to the house, etc." (Luke).

These discrepancies are too great to be explained away merely on the basis of independent witnesses. If either Matthew or Luke is wrong, his reliability is seriously impaired. If the centurion came in person, and conducted the whole business himself, Luke ought to have known it. If he did not come to Jesus at all, but conducted the business through messengers, Matthew ought to have known that. For the sake of our confidence in either narrator

we need to find some method of harmonizing these widely differing accounts. The explanations commonly attempted do not seem to the present writer at all adequate. Thus Broadus says, "Matthew omits these details, and represents the centurion as doing himself what he did through others." Plummer says, "Matthew says nothing about either of these deputations, but puts the message of both into the mouth of the centurion, who comes in person." Farrar says, "It (Matthew's) briefer and less accurate narrative represents the request as coming from the centurion himself, on the every-day principle that '*qui facit per alium facit per se.*'" Rosenmuller says "Matthew, *ut saepe, ita etiam hic, brevitate studiosus fuisse videtur.*" The trouble with these explanations is that Matthew's account is a harmonious whole. He says that the centurion came to Jesus, and thereafter, in the narrative, he makes the centurion speak continually in the first person. No mention is made of any messenger at all. The conversation is too carefully reported to admit the explanations given above. Again, Luke makes it clear that there were messengers, for he reports their personal plea in behalf of the centurion, who was not of their nation, and therefore, in their minds, less likely to have a favorable hearing given his petition by Jesus. Moreover, while it is often the case that one gospel writer gives details omitted by another, it is a questionable method of interpretation to make the solution of a discrepancy rest on an impeachment of the accuracy of a gospel writer. That opens the door to greater difficulties than are solved by it.

II. The Solution of the Difficulty. Bruce hints at the true solution when he says (Expos. Greek Test., Com. on Luke, *in hoc loco*), "comparing the two accounts of this incident, it may be noted that Luke's makes the action of the centurion consistent throughout, as inspired by diffident humility. In Matthew he has the courage to ask Jesus directly, yet he is too humble to let Jesus come to his house."

The solution appears to lie in the fact that both ac-

counts are strictly accurate, but that neither tells the whole story. Each tells enough to give the most important part, the centurion's faith, and the healing of the servant, but each narrative needs the other as its complement.

The centurion's humility prevents him from going to Jesus at first. He sends the elders of the Jews, who make their plea, according to Luke's account. Jesus starts with them to the centurion's house. The centurion hears of the coming of Jesus. There would probably be plenty of people who would be glad to carry the good news, as was Ahimaaz after Absalom's defeat, and the Lord would be very likely to be hindered in the way, as when he went to the house of Jairus. The centurion now sends another deputation with his humble protest, and declaration of belief. While it is not necessary, to a satisfactory explanation, we may suppose that Jesus here expressed his appreciation of such faith. The fact that the Lord had been willing to come thus far now moves the centurion to go in person to him. He was, perhaps, so convinced of the condescension of the one with whom he had to do that he took new courage. He may also have feared that his messengers had not properly represented him, and he could not afford to have any mistake made in so important a matter. Here begins Matthew's account. Luke's statement that the second deputation was sent when Jesus was not far from the house does not at all impair the value of the explanation of Matthew's version now to be given, for we do not know how much is meant by "not far," and besides, events would be likely to move with some rapidity as Jesus drew near to the centurion's home. The centurion comes to Jesus, and, not knowing how accurately his message has been given, for, so far as Luke records, Jesus had not promised to heal the servant, the centurion starts at the initial point of the whole matter. Jesus now says, "I will come and heal him." These words may well have caused the suppliant to think that his protest had not been faithfully delivered, to suspect that, out of mistaken kindness to himself, his

messengers, with less faith than his own, had held it back, or at least modified it, in order that Jesus might go to the house, or near it. Therefore the centurion makes his protest with his own lips. Jesus again expresses his amazement, if we accept the supposition that v. 9 of Luke's version records Christ's words immediately after the messengers had delivered the protest. Jesus' expression of wonder is in the latter case strengthened by "Verily," and enlarged by vv. 11-12 of Matthew's account. Now the messengers, returning to the house, find the cure wrought, and, timing it, find it to have been accomplished when Jesus spoke, in the centurion's presence, his approval of his faith. Viewed thus, we have a beautiful illustration of the divine care exercised by the Holy Spirit over the preparation of the separate but harmonious accounts of the work of our Lord.

BOOKS REVIEWED.

I. OLD TESTAMENT.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea.

By William Rainey Harper. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1905. Crown, 800 vo. pp. CLXXXI and 424. $3.00.

This learned commentary on Amos and Hosea is the fruit of fourteen years' toil by one of the busiest men of the present generation. Of all the men in the world President Harper is the last from whom one would have expected to find such statements as the following: "We may safely deny the ascription to Moses of literary work of any kind." "Moses was pre-eminently a man of affairs; the strenuous nature of his activities as leader and organizer of the tribes of Israel left no opportunity for literary pursuits" (Introduction, p. LXXXVI.). Ghost of Moses! Didst thou lead a more strenuous life than Presidents Harper and Roosevelt? Or is it possible that these gentlemen are not the authors of the numerous works bearing their names? Have they been practicing *illusion* in persuading the public to buy and read certain books that purport to have come from their fertile minds and facile pens? Was it some redactor desirous of furthering the illusion who inserted the third sentence in the preface? If so, his work was skillfully done, for he makes the busy president say, "But in all these years of administrative concern I have had recourse for change, comfort and courage to my work on the Twelve Prophets." Moses is said to have withdrawn from the administrative concern of a busy camp for forty days at a time to commune with the living God, and receive the laws that were to regulate the religious life of his people. Dr. Harper never complains for lack of time, but only for lack of

space: "I ought perhaps to mention that a considerable portion of my manuscript has been thrown out because I had transgressed the limits set for the volume." Now we submit that President Harper's contemporaries may swallow this illusion that the brilliant professor and gifted president and marvelous popular lecturer and teacher is the real author of certain learned tomes that have appeared in the last few years, but future generations of higher critics will marvel at our credulity. They will discover the fact that the busy president had a brother versed in Hebrew and Assyrian lore, and they will attribute to him the nucleus of the famous commentary on Amos and Hosea, especially the portions indicating familiarity with Assyrian research; but by far the greater portions of the work will be distributed among a school of writers, most of whom received their impulse from the great university in which the brothers taught. Some antiquarian of that future time will discover what purports to be a preface in which special acknowledgment is made to the famous redactor, Dr. John M. P. Smith, and other able scholars such as Professors Berry and Goodspeed. The critics will then apportion the work among H, S, B, and G.

Dr. Harper has found time to go through practically all the literature, ancient and modern, on the books of Amos and Hosea. His commentary is a thesaurus of opinion on every conceivable question connected with the text and the interpretation of these two books. One marvels at the completeness which the compilation of various opinions has here attained. Nothing seems to have escaped the keen eye of the compiler. Moreover, he has opinions of his own, and is not afraid to announce them.

An elaborate introduction precedes the commentary proper. The author traces the "Pre-prophetic Movement," from the revolt of Jeroboam I. to the rise of written prophecy in the time of Amos and Hosea. He treats at length of Elijah and Elisha, and the societies over which they presided. He thinks there is a legendary ele-

ment in the picture of Ahab and in the magical powers possessed by Elijah. He defends Elisha against those who count him of little value to Israelitish thought. The so-called "Schools of the Prophets," he regards as guilds or corporations. Dr. Harper regards Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 as the younger of two decalogues, the older being found in Ex. 34: 12-26. What now is the critical view of the date of the Ten Commandments? Our author concludes his discussion of the various views by stating his own: "Upon the whole we shall be justified in assigning the formulation of the younger decalogue in the original form, even with the second commandment, to a period not much later than 750 B. C., the arguments for a still later date not being convincing" (p. LXII). Dr. Harper places the Judæan narrative (J) in the Hexateuch within the century 850-750 B. C., and the Ephraimite narrative (E) within the half-century 800-750 B. C. He closes his discussion of the essential thought of Preprophetism with this statement, "The movement, in so far as it concerns the idea of God, is still henotheistic, not monotheistic."

After an interesting and informing account of the personal life of Amos, our author discusses the message of Amos. "The message of Amos must be obtained from words actually uttered or written by Amos himself. This involves the separation of insertions and additions coming from the pen of later prophets. Nearly one-fifth of the book which bears the name of Amos is thus to be set aside. It is to be conceded at once that the omission of these passages modifies very considerably the nature and content of the message. It is most important, however, in the interest of a true historical development of Israelitish thought to restrict ourselves to those portions of the book, the authenticity of which is incontrovertible. The other portions have just as important a place to occupy in the later literature."

It is well to remind the reader that the numerous sections excised by Dr. Harper as later interpolations and additions are found in all the ancient versions as well as

in the Massoretic Text. The reasons for the removal of these groups of verses are not strictly textual. They are set aside because in the mouth of Amos they condemn certain hypotheses accepted by the modern critics who do not believe in miracles. It is inconvenient to have Amos predicting a restoration of the Davidic throne nearly two centuries before the Babylonian Exile. The two oracles against Tyre and Edom might be used to establish the possibility of an early date for Obadiah and Joel; and the brief oracle against Judah lays emphasis on the rejection of "Jehovah's law and his statutes," a phrase which would suggest to many readers the Pentateuch. Dr. Harper calls Amos 2:4f a Deuteronomic insertion, probably made in Jeremiah's time. The brilliant Messianic promise found in Amos 9:11-15 he would assign to the days of Zerubbabel, or perhaps still later. These and other passages are denied to Amos "in the interest of a true historical development of Israelitish thought." Most Christian readers have a keener interest in tracing the devlopment of the revelation made to the fathers through the prophets. There is an element in the prophetic literature more important than the development of Israelitish thought; for God spoke to the fathers through the prophets (Hebrews 1:1). To trace this revelation, made in many parts and in many manners, is exceedingly interesting and profitable.

President Harper's outline of the book of Amos is quite good; a series of judgment oracles (1, 2); a series of judgment sermons (3-6); a series of judgment visions (7-9).

Scattered throughout the commentary are statements that sound strange to the reader uninitiated into the sceptical treatment of the Biblical historians. To one who has read the account of the reigns of David and Solomon it is a little surprising to learn that in the century in which Amos lived "Israel was, for the first time, enjoying the privileges of civilization." It is also a little confusing to the ordinary mind to learn of the signal failure of Amos from one who belongs to a school of critics for ever re-

minding us that every prophet's message was primarily for the men of his own time. Our author remarks on Amos's failure to reach very many minds, "There were probably not fifty people in Northern Israel who could understand him." He adds a further statement in explanation that will be challenged by many readers of Amos, "It is quite certain that he did not himself have in mind a clear conception of the issues involved in his preaching."

Hosea's writings are exceedingly difficult, and one could pardon a reasonable use even of conjectural emendation; but it is rather suspicious to find one-fourth of his words set aside as not belonging to the original document. We have space for only one question, and that the most improtant, viz: Whether the predictions of Israel's restoration come from Hosea or from some later writer. The naturalistic critics, who look with suspicion on early expressions of the Messianic hope, are agreed in placing in the period after the Babylonian exile most of the beautiful passages in the early prophets which depict the future glory of God's people. Dr. Harper agrees with the critics who deny to Hosea the wonderful promises of the restoration of Israel to the favor of Jehovah (Hosea 1:10-2:1; 2:14-16, 18-23; 3:5; 14:2-9, etc.). This position seems wholly illogical; for our author accepts in full the story of Gomer's unfaithfulness and the prophet's kindness in buying her back from the slavery into which she had fallen. He accepts Hosea 3:1-4 almost exactly as it stands in the received text, but rejects verse 5. How does he escape the inevitable conclusion that the loving Jehovah will also redeem Israel from the slavery into which she has fallen? Concerning Hosea's home after the return of Gomer, he remarks: "The relationship of wife, however, is not re-established; how could it be? She is placed where she will, in discipline, be shut off from intercourse with men, even from the legitimate intercourse with her husband. This period of seclusion will last 'many days.' How long? No indication is given" (Introduction, p. CXLIII.). Does the author mean to imply that

this period of seclusion may last forever? Then Hosea's love has failed, and we are hurled into the abyss of pessimism. The reading of the American Standard Revision seems to this reviewer an accurate translation of the Hebrew of Hosea 3:3, "and I said unto her, thou shalt abide for me many days; thou shalt not play the harlot, and thou shalt not be any man's wife; so will I also be toward thee." Certainly these words ought to have kindled in Gomer's soul hope of ultimate restoration to the old relation of beloved wife. The God of Hosea would not be less forgiving than his prophet. In the latter days he would welcome the repentant people. Hosea had a gospel of hope, because he had a gospel of love. There was hope for poor Gomer, and there was hope for unfaithful Israel. It is utterly perverse in modern critics to make Hosea's last word a message of destruction and despair.

The longer one studies this commentary the more he must admire the author's industry and learning, and the more he regrets that such a scholar should have been completely captured by the Graf-Wellhausen school.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Studies in the Religion of Israel.

By the Rev. L. A. Pooler, B. D., Rector of Down, Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. Edwin S. Gorham, New York. $1.40 net.

Let the author of this attempt to make popular the results of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament state his purpose in his own words: "At the present time the thoughts of Christian people are turned to the Old Testament, and there is much unrest. Most of the books which deal with modern higher criticism are largely technical, or treat only of some particular point. The man in the street has not read them, and would not understand them if he did.

The achæologist is also criticising the Old Testament from his standpoint; and sometimes will not see that any other standpoint is possible. The man in the street has

heard of this also, and, when he reads that the archæologist is attacking the higher critic, imagines that the archæologist is on the side of the older views. Such an idea is quite opposed to facts.

And while this is going on people are asking, 'What does it all mean? Will any one tell us in a way we can understand what effects criticism and archæology have really had upon men's views of the Old Testament; tell us how to read the Old Testament for the future; or is the Old Testament going to be left us at all?'

That is what I am going to try to do. I desire to present in outline the growth of religious ideas amongst the Jews, and, avoiding all disputed points of detail, to describe the development of an inspired people."

Mr. Pooler has made an interesting book. He accepts the literary criticism of the radical critics like Wellhausen and Kuenen, but refuses to go as far as those critics in the reconstruction of the history. He often agrees with the statements of the Biblical historians, even though these statements have been sharply challenged by modern critics of great ability. Thus our author refuses to follow Professor H. Preserved Smith in asserting that Ezra was not an actual man, but only "an impersonation of tendencies." He also refuses to follow Dr. Smith in rejecting the decree of Cyrus for the liberation of the Jews as a pure invention. We can heartily commend our author for rejecting some of the wildest vagaries of modern radical critics. Wherever he accepts and defends the Biblical history we find ourselves in perfect agreement. Wherever he agrees with the radical critics as against the Hebrew historians we find ourslves calling in question the processes by which he arrived at his conclusion.

J. R. SAMPEY.

II. CHURCH HISTORY.

The Study of the History of Music, with an Annotated Guide to Music Literature.

By Edward Dickinson, Professor of the History of Music, Oberlin Conservatory, Oberlin College. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 409. Price $2.50 net.

Professor Dickinson's former work, *The History of Music in the Western Church*, is a most valuable discussion of its particular subject, and one who has enjoyed and profited by the earlier volume would inevitably be attracted by another work from the same source. This work does not profess to be a full history, but a guide to the study of the history of music. It is much too brief to cover with fullness of detail the great subject of which it treats. But for what it is intended to be it is admirable. It is a delight to the eye in mechanical execution (both on the part of writer and printer), a perpetual stimulus to interest in the subject, a constant pleasure in the clear and condensed style of expression, and, considering its brevity, it is remarkably full of information. The ample apparatus of authorities for further study shows the reader whither he may go for research on topics or men. The generalization and statement of main matters of importance are done with excellent taste and skill. For the non-professional reader, who has not time and inclination for more extended study, the salient features of musical history and development are set forth in a most interesting way; while for the musical student the outline and helps for fuller study are very valuable.

Primitive music receives brief notice at the outset, and then more attention is given to the development of church music during the Middle Ages, with some notice of the secular music of that time. Both Catholic and Protestant music about the Reformation times are briefly considered, and their influence on the history are noted. The early developments of modern music are carefully stated, and the parallel developments in musical instruments. The rise of Italian opera is discussed and its place in musical

progress duly estimated. Beginning with J. S. Bach our author takes up the great modern musicians of all schools, giving delightful critical sketches of such masters as Handel, Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schumann, Schubert, Chopin, Berlioz, Liszt, Wagner and many other well-known composers. Along with this brief but satisfactory account of the great masters there is discussion of the progress of theory and practice, both instrumental and vocal. The closing chapters give some account of recent music in all countries. The reader is rapidly taken over this vast field under the skillful guidance of one who knows the road and can give just such comments on the main points of interest while you go along as would a thoroughly competent guide to an eager and intelligent tourist who had not much time to spare. Yet the notes on the literature attached tell you where you can delay longer and more thoroughly investigate, if you wish to repeat your visit on some future occasion when you have more time. In sum, this "guide" to the study of musical history is a very trustworthy and an agreeable one to follow. His learning does not oppress but enlightens, his style does not perplex but pleases, and his judgment does not overawe but win. E. C. DARGAN.

Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter. Geschichte der Christichen Gemeinden vom Beginn der Flavierdynastie bis zum Ende Hadrians dargestellt von Lic. Rudolf Knopf. Privatdozenter der Theologic Zu Marburg. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen, 1905, pp. 468.

The period of forty years treated in this work is one of the most interesting and important in the whole course of church history. The rapidity of development in several directions, notably in that of church government, is positively astounding. Naturally an immense amount of labor has been devoted to the elucidation of these questions, and a man should have something important to say when he offers an entire volume upon the theme. This the present author does not seem to possess. He has written a very good treatise, in harmony with accepted views on the subject, but there is nothing distinctive or

specially able in any part of the treatment. He leans heavily on Weizsäcker, Harnack and other men of international fame. At the same time he goes always to the sources from which he gives frequent and extensive translations. He is fair and just and seeks to find the truth on all disputed questions. Judging from the character of the work and from a statement in the preface one would conjecture that the publisher wanted a new book on the subject treated, and chose an author of some scholarship and ability to make it. This author has conscientiously done his work and the result lies before us, a good book without anything original or especially able

W. J. Mcglothlin.

Bernhard Rothmann. Kirchliche und soziale Wirren in Münster, 1525-1535. Der täuferische Kommunismus. Von Heinrich Detmer, Verlag der Coppenrathschen Buchhandlung, Münster (Westf.) 1904. pp. 146.

The saddest chapter in the history of the Reformation is the story of the Anabaptist Kingdom of Münster. It frightened and humiliated the whole Protestant world at the time, greatly hampered the cause of the Anabaptists and has engaged the attention of many historians since. In recent years the treatment of the subject has become much more calm and judicious, and we have some works of real historic value upon one or another phase of the incident.

The present work deals with one of the leading characters in that fearful tragedy. Rothmann was priest in Münster at the outbreak of the Reformation. He went over to the reformers, succeeded in carrying the city with him and expelled the bishop. Coming in contact with the Anabaptists of the communistic type, he accepted their views and assisted in the effort to realize them in Münster. The world knows the result. In the final struggle Rothmann was killed.

Detmer has given us a very readable and instructive biography which also throws much light upon the general situation and the final struggle. W. J. Mcglothlin.

The Blue Flag of the Covenant.

By Robert Pollock Kerr. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. 1905. 142 pp.

This is a lively and sympathetic presentation of the heroic struggle of the Scotch covenanters in the middle of the seventeenth century. It is designed for the use of the "Covenanters," a Presbyterian organization of young people, and for this purpose it must be very useful. It is well for this age to recall the heroism of the past in devotion to religious ideas. The book will be read with interest and profit by all who are not insensible to the spectacle of noble self-denial even unto death.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Essentials in Mediæval and Modern History.

By Samuel Bannister Harding, Ph. D., Professor of European History, Indiana University. 8vo, half leather, 655 pages, with maps and illustrations. Price $1.50. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

This work, published in the Essentials in History series, edited by Professor Hart, of Harvard University, begins with a survey of the World from the fall of the Western Empire to the year 800. From the latter date there is given an account of the development of the various important countries which have influenced the progress of civilization. Although most of the space is devoted to European nations, yet various others, as the United States and Japan, are dealt with as occasion demands. Each chapter ends with a brief summary, presenting a succinct statement of the whole ground covered by the chapter, which may be used to excellent advantage in reviewing. Furthermore, at intervals through the book there are inserted, with marginal headings, quotations from the original sources and other eminent works. The maps and illustrations are particularly noteworthy. Not only are they numerous, but they have been prepared and collected with unusual care. This is an excellent text-book or brief reference work. W. J. McGlothlin.

III. CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The Christian's Relation to Evolution. A Question of Gain or Loss.

By Franklin Johnson, D.D., LL. D., Professor in the University of Chicago. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago 1905. $1.00 net.

The author here neither opposes nor advocates the doctrine of evolution. He is concerned only to estimate its value to the Christian who holds it. What does it contribute to his mental satisfaction, to his adoration of God, and to the forces which he employs in his warfare against sin in himself and in the world? When cast into the scales of our accustomed Christian beliefs, how much does it disturb them? Is it the duty of the Christian evolutionist to restore their poise and balance? If the doctrine enriches him at one point does it impoverish him at others? If it imperils his cherished convictions or his activity in the service of God and man, how shall he escape this danger? It is such questions as these that the author considers in the sixteen chapters of this little book.

The author's answers and spirit in dealing with these questions are well indicated in his closing chapter on "Afterthoughts." The advocates of the doctrine of evolution, he says, are happy because it has been so quickly and so widely accepted, not only by men of science, but also by theologians. They remind us that but a single generation had passed away, when "The Descent of Man," so warmly decried at first, was warmly welcomed, and that it is now commended as highly by the theologians as by the biologists. "But," he justly asks, "has not the rush of the theologians been somewhat unseemly? May we not find something to approve in Prof. Howison's words: 'Since the diffusion of the doctrines of Darwin and Spencer, the more alert portion of the religious world has exhibited a busy haste to readjust its theological conceptions to the new views. In fact, these efforts have been noticeable for their speed and adroitness, rather than for their large and considerate judgment. In their anxiety for harmony with the new, they

have not seldom lost sight of the cardinal truths in the old." The advance of men of science, such as Spencer, Romanes, John Fiske and Professor Shaler, toward theism and Christianity, he concedes, may well cause us to rejoice; but ought we to be equally pleased with the recession of Christian thinkers? In this connection we may well recall the utterances of Professor George H. Darwin, a son of the illustrious author of "The Descent of Man," in his late inaugural address before the British Society for the Advancement of Science.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Garden of Nuts. Mystical Expositions with an Essay on Christian Mysticism.
By the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905, pp. 232.

Dr. Nicoll is essentially a rational mystic and this is an excellent example of his excellent work. The essay on mysticism sets forth the essentials of that type of thought and life, while the other brief essays set forth what he believes "to be an old, true, precious and divinely sanctioned method of interpretation. It is not our purpose to revive the purely mystical and allegorical reading of the Bible." p. 81. "Nevertheless we are certain that the church of Christ is in danger of losing the key to the wonderful and mysterious world of Scripture." p. 82. This is due to the bold literalism of the time. His plea for a profounder interpretation of Scripture and its larger and higher use in preaching is powerful and ought not to go without effect. W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Life and Religion. An Aftermath from the Writings of the Right Honorable Professor F. Max Müller.
By His Wife. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. 1905, pp. 237.

This is a compilation of striking passages on "Life and Religion" taken from the published works and the private correspondence of the late distinguished Prof. Max Muller. Many of them are most beautiful and striking, revealing the tender heart and deep religiousness of

the great scholar. The reader lingers upon them, charmed by the music of the words and the penetration of the thought. The volume is beautifully gotten up and would make a good holiday present. W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

Gleanings From Paul's Prison, Or Studies for the Daily Life in the Epistle to the Philippians.

By Wayland Hoyt, D.D. Published by the Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. pp. 527, 5¼x2½; price 25c.

This vigorous, suggestive and inspiring work of Dr. Hoyt is well known and deserves continued success.

W. O. CARVER.

Immortality.

By William L. Seabrook. Published by the Vir Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 203 pages 5x7; $1.00 net.

This is a vigorous discussion, drawing on poetry, science, philosophy and experience for argument and illustration. It seems designed more for comfort than for argument but is not deficient for this even.

It is such a book as "the average man" will find most serviceable on this subject of profound and universal interest. The work is well done from its standpoint. The publishers have good reason to hope that it "will prove a source of comfort to those in sorrow, will strenghten the faith of those who doubt and will confirm the hope of those who trust." W. O. CARVER.

Phyllis Burton.

By Mrs. S. R. Graham Clark. Published by A. B. P. Socicty, 1905.

A good, clean, wholesome, half religious novel. Full of life and love, humor and pathos. Its appropriate motto is from Wordsworth:

> "Shall show us how divine a thing
> A woman can be made."

W. O. CARVER.

Robbie's Bible Stories.

By Gertrude Smith. Thirty-three illustrations. Published by Henry Alternus Company, Philadelphia. 1905; 223 pages, 5x7. Price 50c.

Excellent illustrations, splendid paper and beautiful

type. The stories are not well told and are mutilated out of a sickly horror of the tragic until I would not read them to my children without restoring the eliminated parts. W. O. Carver.

The Churches and Educated Men. A Study of the Relation of the Church to Makers and Leaders of Public Opinion.

By Edwin Noah Hardy, M. A. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. 1905, $1.25.

The author seems to have been stung into the investigation that issues in these chapters by the current charge that the Christian church is losing her hold on men of intellect. If the church is winning success rather than suffering defeat in this respect, then let the welcome truth silence the carping pessimists and arouse and stimulate the hopeful. If it be ascertained that there is increasing strength, more vitality, and a positive and healthful development, then by all means let us have the advantages and encouragements accruing therefrom. The investigation is undertaken "with no theory to uphold but simply to ascertain the facts." The field of investigation is confined to this country and to the question as to whether the leaders of men here have been and are "indifferent to the message and mission of the church." The author limits himself further by making choice of the college man as "the best all-round representative of the man of brains." The facts and figures respecting the religious life of the college man in this country are in good measure accessible, trutstworthy and full of interest in their bearing on this subject. He has summoned to the witness stand not one whose testimony he had reason to question. He corresponded with every college and university in the country founded before 1825 and with most of those established in recent years, consulted only reliable historians or authorities; and, wherever practicable, he cites authorities best qualified to speak. Thus he furnishes data inaccessible to those who are not near the largest libraries, and who have neither time nor patience for such painstaking investigations. He presents the results grouped

under special periods, which are so named as roughly to characterize the religious status of the college in each period. These periods are: The Sovereignty of the Ecclesiastic, or the Period of the Beginnings (1638-1770); The Spiritual Ebbtide, or The Period of the Revolution (1770-1795); The Reign of Infidelity, or The Period of Rapid Declension (1795-1800); The Religious Renaissance, or The Period of Recovery (1800-1810); Eddies and Cross-Currents, or The Period of Transition (1810-1820); The Great Perplexing Problems and Peculiar Perils, or The Period of Adaptation (1850-1875); The Modern Awakening, or The Period of Reconstruction (1850-1875); and The Present Outlook.

The grouping is somewhat labored but it helps one to an intelligent grasp of the situation as a whole. Some marked characteristics do differentiate the groups, and in general, these are of such a nature as to form steps or stages in the development of the religious life of the American college. The conclusion seems inevitable that this development has been a true, sane and positive advance, that, as the author says, there has been "a most remarkable and significant evolution in American educational institutions," that college men for some reason have exerted an influence out of proportion to their numerical strength, many of them reaching the front ranks of intellectual leadership, and that in increasing proportions, with slight fluctuations, from the first, college men in America have been professing Christians. In the first period for special reasons there was a larger proportion of professing Christians than to-day; from 1775 to 1795, about 12 per cent; from 1795 to 1800 only 5 per cent; at the opening of the nineteenth century, 15 per cent or more; then after another sinking spell of the percentage it rose to 25 at the end of the first quarter. From this time on to 1850 there is a gradual gain till 33 per cent is registered. Eight years later more than 40 per cent are Christians. Just before the war the percentage reached 45, and remained unchanged for a score of years. From 1885 to 1910 there was a slow but sure gain, till more

than half of American students are now professing Christians. The outlook for the new century is regarded as most encouraging. The author reasonably apprehends that his method of dealing with the subject will not prove altogether satisfactory to the student of social problems, but he is certainly to be commended for gathering together such an array of facts and figures bearing in a real way upon this vital subject, and for the grasp and skill he has shown in grouping the results under epochs, not arbitrarily, but rationally determined. The Pilgrim Press has done its part well. GEO. B. EAGER.

Christianity and Socialism.

By Washington Gladden. New York, Eaton & Mains, 1905. Price $1 net.

The author's frank apology for the title of this little book of five lectures forestalls criticism, for though not a formal treatise of its theme it does have something to say on the two great matters which its title indicates. There are five lectures, delivered before Drew Theological Seminary, with the following titles: The Sermon on the Mount as the Basis of Social Reconstruction, Labor Wars, The Programme of Socialism, The True Socialism, Lights and Shadows of Municipal Reform. Both Dr. Gladden himself and many others have already said most of the things said in the lectures, and yet they are—for the most part—things that need to be often said, and said by many, and in different places. The need of basing all true reform on the regenerate life and the Christian ethic; the importance of distinguishing between Socialism and Anarchism and giving to the former credit for all its good, and intelligent criticism upon all its crudeness and inadequacy; the necessity of taking sane and just views of the relations of labor and capital; the right definition of social duty and of social ideals; and the pressing weight of the problem, both theoretical and practical, which confronts the American people in the matter of municipal government—these are the topics insisted on in the book. They are presented in a clear and pleasing style, with

a balance of judgment and a fervor of earnestness which commend them to all readers, even though here and there something in thought or statement compels qualification or dissent. E. C. Dargan.

How to Conduct a Sunday School.

By Marion Lawrence. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, etc. 1905. $1.25 net.

No Sunday-school man in the field is better or more favorably known than the author of this book. The book might be termed, as some one has suggested, an encyclopedia of Sunday-school wisdom by the most experienced writer on the subject. As secretary of the International Sunday-school Committee, Mr. Lawrence has been called to visit schools and conventions of teachers in every part of the world, and, probably, has compared ideas with more workers than any other leader in the land. Naturally, therefore, there is evident here a broadness of vision and treatment that make the work likely to be about as useful to one school, or teacher, as to another. His varied experience as teacher, superintendent, query-master of *The Sunday-school Times,* and secretary of the International Convention; extended first and last over thirty odd years, has enabled him to make this volume a real Sunday-school handbook, equally valuable to each department and every sort of school. It deals with all phases of the work, not from the standpoint of an impossible idealism, but, for the most part at least, in a practical way, and in a way to help others to make the best theories and principles practicable and actual. Rightly read, it will prove useful, we are sure, to pastors, superintendents and teachers alike. Geo. B Eager.

Bible Study Popularized.

By Frank P. Lee. The Winona Publishing Company, Chicago. 1904.

This book recognizes the signs of a growing popular interest in Bible study and aims to promote it. It is well to be interested in Biblical criticism and questions *about* the Bible, it is of far greater importance that the people

study *the Sacred Word itself.* A more intelligent familiarity with the English Bible is a demand of the times. The importance of giving the Bible a more prominent place in educational systems is being recognized. Improved methods of teaching the Bible, in the Bible school and in our institutions of learning, are engaging the attention of our best educators and leaders. Summer assemblies, Sacred Literature Courses, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. Bible Classes, and other kindred agencies, are helping to give prominence to the subject and to broaden and deeper popular interest in it. This book, says the author, is a modest contribution toward the promotion of this interest. It does not pretend to enter the arena of critical or technical discussions. It is the outgrowth of extended personal experience and thought, and simply seeks to indicate certain lines and methods of study that have proved helpful to the author and to others, and to give such practical suggestion and illustrative examples as it is hoped may stimulate and guide others who are seeking after biblical knowledge—in short to give the help needed to *start men aright* in the study of the Word on their account.

The various methods of studying the Bible are brought under review and their several advantages considered. The Study of the Bible by Periods, The Study of the Bible by Books, The Study of the Bible Characters, The Study of Sermons and Addresses in the Bible, The Study of Bible Scenes and Incidents and The Study of the Bible by Topics, are all considered and illustrated in a way to make their treatment helpful to preachers and teachers. The last chapter, on "Effective Means of Promoting Bible Study," appeals especially to the pastor and deals with Bible exposition in the pulpit, the advantages of it to the preacher, the benefits accruing to the people, and suggestions as to practical methods.

To many a preacher and teacher denied access to the class-room of the seminary, or to more elaborate works, the book will come as a god-send. GEO. B. EAGER.

IV. EVANGELISM.

The Evangelistic Awakening.

By Wentworth F. Stewart, D.D. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati. 1905; net 75c.

The Evangelistic Note.

By W. J. Dawson. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 1905; net $1.25.

The Perennial Revival.

By Wm. B. Riley. The Winona Publishing Company, Chicago. 1904.

Evangelism, Old and New.

By Rev. A. C. Dixon. New York, American Tract Society. 1905; price, $1.00.

These books may be grouped as representative of "the evangelistic movement" of our day and a sign of the times. A new literature on "Evangelism," "Revivals" and "The Holy Spirit" is fast growing up about us which is symptomatic of a welcome change. "Evangelism" is the watchword of the hour. Conservatives and liberals alike have accepted the term and with one voice, if not one mind, are calling for aggressive evangelism. A little while ago evangelism was in general disfavor. The multiplication of professional evangelists, the abuse of the evangelistic method by confining it to periodic and spasmodic efforts, the unstable and disappointing results that followed such services, amounting in many instances to reaction, the questionable methods, unsane and unhealthy and often mercenary, of many of the "evangelists," the tendency toward fanaticism and false "holiness" ideas, often proving divisive and hurtful to the churches, these and many other things which will suggest themselves, caused large numbers of earnest and intelligent ministers and church members to become passively averse, if not positively repugnant to the whole idea and movement of evangelism as it was known in the generation now passing away. Moreover other adverse or neutralizing influences were at work during that period which are now giving place to something better. From the beginning of the prevalence of the scientific spirit and the

application of the historical method to the study of religion we have had "an age of doubt," a reign of the questioning spirit. Many of the doubters were earnest seekers after truth, loving Thomases indeed, but their doubt was benumbing and neutralizing. Then criticism was largely hostile in spirit and destructive in method. Commercialism was rampant and raging, dazzling men's minds with dreams of sudden wealth, and blinding their vision to spiritual things. The world had become intoxicated with the "get-rich-quick" idea, all interests came to be considered in terms of revenue, even evangelical churches, grown rich, grew correspondingly worldly, pulpit and pew were more or less dominated by the over-powering commercial spirit, and so the prophetic note was hushed, the Spirit was quenched and worldliness prevailed.

Now a sea change has come over the world. The solitary voices in the wilderness which proclaimed the early advent of a great spiritual revival have become a mighty chorus. Indeed these auguries of the prophesying heart are beginning to make good. The signs are abundant that the barren period of doubt, negative criticism, purblind commercialsim and galvanized evangelism, is giving place to an era of genuine revival, purified faith, quickened moral fervor, true and vital evangelism and an imperious popular demand for civic righteousness. Let us thank God and take courage.

The little volume which stands first in this list aims to give a general view of the present evangelistic situation—approaching the subject historically to indicate what has led up to this condition; but especially to set forth the fundamental principles that need emphasis and suggest the conditions of acceptable and successful evangelism in the future.

The author, as Dr. George Elliott informs us in the introduction, has been a successful pastor and is "now one of the most forceful leaders of men among the younger presiding elders of Methodism." He has shown himself not merely a master of methods, but of aggressive

evangelism, and "better still, a dynamic center of inspiration." In "part first," three chapters, he gives a suggestive analysis of the present state of evangelism, deals in an intelligent and appreciative way with the current awakening, and points to the signs of hope in the outlook. In "part second," six chapters, he shows what the evangelist ought to be and what he ought not to be, to be truly useful; what the management, methods and dynamic of meetings ought to be; what the message should be to command attention and accomplish its purpose; the need and opportunity of the evangelistic pastor; the increasing demand for the evangelistic church that evangelism may become constructive, and, lastly, that world-evangelization involves a vital evangelism at home and abroad.

In *The Evangelistic Note,* Dr. Dawson, a leading Congregational minister of England, tells in the opening chapter, the story of the events that led him to resign a great London parish and enter upon the evangelistic work which has made him so useful and famous in England and America. In the other thirteen chapters he gives us the addresses he delivered during the great Plymouth Church meeting last year. The volume as a whole will be found to carry a message of vital and exceptional value to Christian ministers and workers of all denominations who are interested in the efforts now making for a re-awakening and a re-enlisting of the churches in a great forward movement for the evangelization of the world. But nothing here will be surer to command the attention of the reader, especially if he be a live minister, than the story of the radical change wrought in Dr. Dawson's own ministry in the direction of a more distinctively evangelistic note in his preaching. It seems that it was primarily, under God, the result of a Free Church Council Meeting which resolved itself into a midnight expedition to the slums of Brighton. This led Dr. Dawson to invite the evangelist Gypsy Smith, to hold meetings in his church, which, in turn, gave rise to a procession through the crowded section of London, headed by himself, his deacons, and two Salvation Army bands;

and which gathered in devotees of the saloons and dance halls, and brought them to the church for a midnight service. When he stood up to give out "Rescue the Perishing," and saw and heard those people from the slums, who doubtless had learned the hymn in Sunday-school in their childhood, take it up and sing it with feeling, and tears, he was stirred to the heart as never before. It followed that several hundred of these people avowed a purpose to reform and begin a Christian life, and, ultimately, the temper of his church and the nature of his ministry became distinctively evangelistic. "I came to see," he says, "that it was not worth while being a minister unless I could get the old Wesleyan evangelistic note into my ministry." The outcome, we know, has been the restoration of the note of reality to his preaching and the reawakening of a keen joy and absorbing interest in the ministry, which for awhile he was seriously disposed to abandon for literary work. That story has a moral. From this man's experience every bright, aspiring, book-loving, ambitions young preacher should take warning and learn a lesson. A minister devoid of the passion for soul-saving, of the joy that comes from bringing men into the kingdom of God, can find nothing that will keep it from stooping to worldly ideals that take the heart out of evangelism.

In *The Perennial Revival* Rev. W. B. Riley, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, himself a wide-awake evangelistic pastor, makes a plea not only for evangelism, but for what, by a sort of misnomer, he calls "a Perennial Revival." This he claims is "the Normal State for the Church of Jesus Christ." Those who oppose it "set themselves against apostolic religion and the apostolic church." "The springs of revivals which have characterized recent centuries have been too much after the wet-weather sort; they have opened only at a certain season and remained in action for a very short time." After telling of a lad that had seen the waters troubled at a "certain season" and others stepping in to be made whole, while he must remain outside in his paralysis, and

knowing that when the waters grew quiet it would be a twelve-months before the opportunity would return, he says it was "the very bitterness of that experience that gave origin to the idea of this book" and "emphasis to a ministry which for twenty years has sought as assiduously to reach men's souls in the dog-days of August as in the set season of January." In fifteen chapters he pleads earnestly, if not always wisely and well, for the "Perennial revival," citing as its warrant "the primitive church" and "the apostolic spirit," showing the relation of "prayer" and "the enduement of power" to it, how the "results" are to be husbanded and made continuous and constructive, how street preaching, "pew rentals," "Bible study" and "giving" stand related to it, and how it is to issue in "the reformation of society," and "the evangelization of the world."

The books are all inspired and pervaded by a kindred spirit but commend themselves to our attention all the more because of their differences of view and style and make-up. There is unity in diversity. They represent variant types and classes of mind, but they make a common and powerful plea for what the world desperately needs—a vital Christian evangelism.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Evangelism, Old and New.

By Rev. A. C. Dixon. New York. American Tract Society. 1905. $1.00.

This little book seems to be the substance of various sermons addresses or articles dealing with a subject which the author's well-known ability and success as an evangelist pastor well qualify him to discuss. Those who know anything of Dr. Dixon's personality and work will not need to be told that his point of view is that of the old evangelical faith. The inspiration of the Bible, the deadly sinfulness of man, his need of salvation by the vicarious atonement of Christ, the necessity of the new birth as a work of the Holy Spirit, are all here and unhesitatingly presented as fundamental. Conviction,

positiveness, clearness, simplicity, warmth characterize the treatment. There is abundant illustration and evangelistic fervor. It is impossible to feel as sure as does the author of many points of interpretation and doctrine, nor can one agree to all his statements and conclusions. But this would be true of any book on a subject so wide and varied both in its doctrinal and practical aspects. One who believes in the saving power of Jesus and desires by preaching or personal work or both to bring souls under that power will find much to help and encourage him in the study of this book. E. C. DARGAN.

Evangelism.

By Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. The Bookstore, East Northfield, Mass. 1904.

This little volume consists of five lectures delivered before the Theological Seminaries of Hartford, Chicago, Berkley and Dayton. The lectures were stenographically reported and make a small book of 99 pages. The characteristic manner and ideas of the well-known preacher appear. The preaching of the gospel of an atoning Savior in a world lost in sin is emphasized as the need of the hour, against any merely ethical exhortation and humanitarian scheme of social redemption. The conversion, divine call and spiritual equipment of the evangelist are insisted on. The work of the church is urged, and hints are given as to the proper conduct of evangelistic services. While there is nothing very new or striking in the treatise it is practical, and may be of more than passing interest and service to all who are interested in the important subject of which it treats.

E. C. DARGAN.

V. APOLOGETICS.

Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der christlichen Religion.

J. F. Lehmann's Verlag, München. 1905. pp. 386.

This volume contains ten essays of from twenty to sixty pages each, as follows: The Essence and Origin of Re-

ligion, its Roots and their Unfolding by Prof. Dr. L. V. Schroeder, Vienna; the Old Testament in the Light of Modern Investigation, by Prof. D. H. Gunkel, Berlin; The Gospel and Primitive Christianity (The New Testament in the Light of Historical Investigation), by Prof. D. A. Deissmann, of Heidelberg; Saving Faith and Dogma, by Prof. D. Dr. A. Dorner, Königsberg; Religion and Morals, by Prof. D. Dr. W. Herrman, Marburg; Christianity and the Teutons, by Sup. D. F. Meyer, Zwickau; Science and Religion, by Prof. D. Dr. R. Eucken, Jena; Religion and School, by Prof. Litt. D. Dr. Rein, Jena; The Unifying Power of Religion, by Lic. G. Traub, Dortmund; and the Essence of Christianity, by Prof. Lic. Dr. G. Wobbermin, Berlin.

The purpose of the work as described in the preface is "to set forth and further the position of religion in the life of the present time; each writer gives information concerning the field with which he is specially acquainted but together they address, not the circle of fellow specialists, but all on whose hearts the highest questions lie and who have part in the movements, doubts and unrest" of the times. The contributors are younger professors of the German universities, liberals and progressives. They classify themselves among those who believe that in Christianity there has been revealed an eternal truth and unfolded a manner of life which deserve perpetual lordship; but on the other hand as convinced that the present condition of religion does not correspond to the demands of the age. The title of the book, "Contributions to the Further Development of the Christian Religion" sufficiently indicates their standpoint and purpose. They hope to help that large body of intelligent German laymen who, in the unrest of the time, find it difficult to hold on to their faith. They claim to stand midway between the strictly orthodox and the wildly radical. The essays are written in popular and attractive style, free from technicalities. They are the product of ample learning and religious earnestness, and afford the best brief presentation of current opinion in

university circles with which I am acquainted. They contain the essence of what is generally believed by the more advanced German theologians, and are exceedingly interesting reading. Many of their conclusions can not be accepted for a moment, but they do not set them forth as final. On the contrary Gunkel, for example, admits that every position he takes may be changed by further study and investigation. He only sets forth what he now believes about the Old Testament in the light of the most thorough investigation he has been able to make. Chief interest attaches, of course, to the essays on the Old and New Testaments. The negative criticism of Gunkel is already well known. It is not so well known, perhaps, that he still holds the Old Testament in high esteem and devotes his life to teaching it. At the close of an eloquent passage in praise of its value (p. 53f), he declares that its rejection would be an unspeakable loss not only to religion but also to the entire world of culture.

The essay on the New Testament is perhaps a little less radical than that on the old. The author's view of the Gospel of John is interesting. He declares that the question of authorship is not so important as that of date and standpoint. "It is the Pauline Gospel, the grand reflex of Pauline piety—Pauline Christianity through and through, even to the most surprising echoes of Paul's favorite turns of thought. Therefore it is at least later than Paul. The other possibility that Paul has this Gospel to thank for his best thought can be expressed, but is very improbable." It will be seen by this brief quotation that the author gives the fourth Gospel an early date and a very high value.

It is to be hoped that the book will appear in English.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Ideas From Nature.

By William Elder, A.M., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry, Colby University. Published by A. B. P. Society, Phila. 202 pages, 5¼x2¼. Price 25c.

This brief work of Prof. Elder was published two and

a half years ago, but it has not been my good fortune to read it until recently. He calls it "Talks With Students" and for them it is remarkably adapted. I account it a truly remarkable little volume. It is a statement and defense of the *Design Argument* for God's presence in nature. Of course the argument can not be exhaustive in this compass, but it is satisfactory. The author is abreast of the times, at once scientific and devout and he writes with irresistible clearness and force. I heartily wish that the millions of young people who study natural sciences might all read this book and that very many others would join them in the reading. W. O. Carver.

A First Primer of Apologetics.

By Robert Mackintosh, D.D. Seeond Edition. London. Andrew Melrose. 1904. 120 pages 5x7.

A very good, frank primer, based on a good knowledge of the literature and from the modern viewpoint. In the main the positions are well taken and the proper lines of defense indicated. His dealing with critical questions is unsteady and inadequate and his treatment of the Ressurrection is by no means calculated to give much help to one who needs it. W. O. Carver.

The Gospel and the Church.

By Alfred Loisy. Translated by Christopher Home. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905. $1.00 net.

This book and Harnack's *Essence of Christianity* that called it forth have made a great and by no means ephemeral stir in the world and given rise to quite a literature. When Loisy's book first saw the light the author was little known, to-day his fame is co-extensive with Harnack's. From 1881 to 1893 he was Professor of Hebrew in the *Institut Catholique* in Paris. In 1893 he was deprived of his chair and appointed chaplain to a girls' school. In the same year this book was placed in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum.* To-day, however, he occupies a chair and enjoys academic freedom in *Ecole des Hautes Etudes.*

The book has been a revelation to many of an un-

suspected *liberal* drift among Roman Catholics. It belongs distinctly to the liberal theological literature of our day—of the critical type. Primarily it is a reply to Harnack and his school of thinkers, but at bottom it is an attempt to vindicate the chief claims of the Roman Catholic Church in the light of modern progress. After an elaborate introduction of twenty-two pages it discusses: I. The Sources of the Gospels; II. The Kingdom of Heaven; III. The Son of God; IV. The Church; V. The Christian Dogma; VI. The Catholic Worship.

It is interesting to note the points of agreement and of dissent between Loisy and Harnack, and to watch the Frenchman's art of parry and thrust in dealing with the lusty German. The two are agreed in the general view that the Gospels are not, strictly speaking, historical narratives; they have been so changed by the interpretation of the facts by their authors that they give an exaggerated and ideal view of the Messiah. "It is true, however," says Loisy, "that these narratives represent a normal development of the history of Christ." But the very nature of their subject, the critical examinations of the two versions represented, taken separately and compared, and an analysis of evangelical tradition, he goes on to say, " make it impossible to regard them as a definite expression of historical memories." From this on the two authors walk together no further. As has been pointed out, they separate and turn back to back. *Development* is the watchword of both, but in Harnack's view the historical development of Christianity is a degeneracy, while in Loisy's it is normal and in the direction evermore of higher and more perfect forms. Harnack finds the essence of Christianity in Christ's relation to us, and in his revelation of the fatherly love of God; Loisy finds it in the institutions and mediations of the church. The former is eminently subjective; the latter prevailingly objective. The former represents the Protestant principle of freedom in extreme exercise; the latter represents the Catholic principle of ecclesiastical authority as culminating legitimately in the Pope, in a form

that, to Protestants at least, seems extreme. He says: "To the churches maintained or established in barbarian lands, and in the nations themselves, the Pope appears not only as the supreme judge of all ecclesiastical causes and controversies; from the end of the eighth century, he acts as the depository of the imperial tradition, transferring the title of Cæsar to Charlemagne and his successors. Toward the close of the eleventh century, all authority seems vested in him, not only over particular churches, but also over nations. The Pope has become social instructor, tutor of monarchies, head of the Christian confederation, while he remains and becomes more and more supreme as the chief of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the arbiter of the faith, the guardian of discipline, the bishop of all the churches. His two offices are not distinguished one from the other" (pp. 160, 161). The author does not, however, regard the vatican definitions as final. He thinks it possible that the future will make observations in the nature and object of ecclesiastical authority that will influence and modify its exercise. Though the primitive church knew only two sacraments, our author regards the present number of sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church as legitimate, as the inevitable outcome of the social, political and moral conditions surrounding the church. "The end is still to come," he says, "as sacramental developments, continuing to follow the general lines, can only end with the church herself."

The book is singularly clear and bewitchingly clever—brilliant, learned, and, in the main, logical. At points he unquestionably gets the better of his adversary. Whether you agree with him or not, you follow him with pleasure --until you draw back in horror from his conclusions concerning *The Church!* You are all the more interested in parts because you do not agree with him. You are glad to see Catholicism presented from such a view-point, for he represents a growing school of liberalism among Roman Catholics on the continent and in America, that is stigmatized as *l'Americanisme,* and that stands as the

antithesis of ultra-montanism. It has been well said that it has proved a revelation to many of how a "liberal" Roman Catholic theologian applies the canons of modern criticism and the principles of the evolution philosophy to the exposition of the great problems of Christianity. No wonder that it was interdicted by the Archbishop of Paris. The book is worth reading, too, if only to see how an enlightened Roman Catholic regards worship—how he attempts to trace and justify the immense "development" from the few simple data of worship in apostolic Christianity, into the prolonged, complicated and elaborate service of the Roman Catholic mass, with its incense, responses, confessions, glories, kissings, crosses and genuflections. Alas! what creatures of education we are —at least "alas!" when the education gives a fatally false direction to development. GEO. B. EAGER.

VI. ECCLESIOLOGY.

Ecclesiology. A Study of the Churches.
Second Edition, Carefully Revised by Edwin Charles Dargan, Professor of Ecclesiology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Chas. T. Dearing, Louisville, Ky. 1905.

The readers of the first edition of this excellent treatise will find in this revision many improvements. It is easily the best of all Baptist ecclesiologies which pursue the traditional method, and from that viewpoint is probably as complete as possible at the present stage of our knowledge. The treatment is thoroughly Baptistic in the traditional sense of that term and yet neither polemical nor apologetic in spirit.

The author manifests a frank, open, judicial mind ready to observe, weigh and allow for any and all pertinent evidence upon the many hitherto unsolved and seemingly insoluble problems of the church. As a text-book for the study of ecclesiology along traditional lines it is without a superior. Because of its very excellence it reveals not only the virtues but also the very glaring defects of this method of treatment. Those who studied the subject un-

der the author's predecessors will find the ecclesiology of Dr. Boyce here brought down to date and fully presented. The method pursued in these investigations is first to construct an ecclesiastical pattern from the New Testament, then to show how this "New Testament church" has been modified in the course of history and then discuss the present situation. So we have the usual factitious "model church," constructed by the ecclesiologist from scraps of Scripture more or less referring to church affairs and artfully arranged to embody the author's ideals. Then the Baptist churches of to-day are shown to conform to this model more nearly than any others. The conclusion is of course that the Baptist churches are "the New Testament churches" of to-day and specially entitled to be so labeled. The reader will see the signposts of traditional ecclesiological methods of investigation all through the discussion of Part I. on the Polity of the Church. But the author is frank enough to admit that at certain points Baptist churches vary from the model by omitting much that is now considered to be obsolete and by adding much which new conditions have rendered necessary. So the model is recognized as subject to changes by the exigencies of time and place. He does not, however, consider these admissions fatal to the assumption which furnishes the working hypothesis of the traditional method of treatment. To one who is willing to submit the problems of the church's life to this method of solution the discussion will be found able and satisfactory. And the reader will not be disturbed by any mention of any other method of ecclesiological research for our author is perfectly silent on the recent sociological method of approaching the study of the church. But the perusal of even so able a treatise as the one under review leads to the inevitable conclusion that the so-called model is not at all a creature of the New Testament writers, but is the invention and product of the ecclesiologist's mind. Out of biblical excerpts as his material he has constructed an ideal which to his mind inspired writers would have approved, but which as far as their remains

show they did not. Nor is there the slightest evidence that they ever felt a need of "the model" in their planting and culture of churches. Yet so great is the exegetical skill and historical insight of our author that one is all but convinced that he has the mind of Paul in this matter. Another serious objection to this traditional method, even if we allow that an authoritative regulative model may be derived from the Scriptures, is the literalistic way in which it is made to apply as a mould or pattern for churches. This is utterly at variance with the use Scripture submits to in other lines of life. It savors more of judaistic legalism where the letter killeth than of Christian liberty where the spirit maketh alive. Christianity has never been hospitable to the stereotyped and procrustean, and submits to no law but the law of liberty. Baptists in their ecclesiology have ever been too prone to follow the path of legalistic literalistic use of Scripture which they so strenuously object to in the Disciples' theology.

But one may ask has present day ecclesiology no relation to the New Testament? Is it purely a matter of present expediency? Not at all. The New Testament is both authoritative and regulative, and profitable in all its teaching. But the question is how do these writings speak and how did the inspired man intend his words to be applied to life. The objection lies against the method of interrogating the Scriptures and their application to life. It is against the use of the words of Scripture in a way not intended by the inspired author. Hitherto ecclesiological study has been pursued too much as a theoretical dogmatical search for a statical ideal church, whereas, the Scripture deals with the dynamic and real. These writings instead of presenting us with a static model church show us everywhere the suffering, defective, diseased dynamic church and directions for its relief. A true biblical ecclesiology would deal almost entirely with ecclesiastical pathology. If we begin with the nature and function of the new life in Christ and study the laws of its development and growth in church fellowship and

work in an organism of which Christ is the head and his people severally members thereof we have passed into the sphere of spiritual biology and dynamical ecclesiology. Here we have a living organism whose form is incidental to the laws of its life and derived not by external imposition but by the internal impulses inherent in the nature and functions of its peculiar life. It is a living growing body subject to disease and responsive to culture. Under this method ecclesiology becomes a science of ecclesiastical therapeutics, of sacred, social physiology and pathology. It seems that the Scriptures thus treat the churches and give us a good method for our present day ecclesiology whose end is the cure and culture of the body of Christ. This method of treatment yet remains to be written up but the rise of sociological study bids fair soon to make possible such a treatise. At present, however, it is new enough to be classed as heresy.

But while dissenting from the method of treatment adopted by this work we must admit that the objections raised above are less pertinent to this book than to any other traditional treatise. The author's treatment of the ordinances and work of the churches is also presented in good and full exposition in Parts II. and III. with good judgment and thorough scholarship. The book is to be commended to every one who wishes to take up the study of the churches and especially to pastors. The author already well known for his choice literary style will find his fame yet greater among the readers of this revised edition.

A. J. Dickinson.

VII. PHILOSOPHY.

The Immanence of God.

By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. Published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New Yrrk. 1905. pp. 153, 5x7.

The general purpose of this work may best be seen from its brief preface: "The undivineness of the natural and the unnaturalness of the divine is the great heresy

of popular thought respecting religion. The error roots itself in a deistic and mechanical philosophy, and in turn produces a large part of the misunderstandings that haunt religious and irreligious thought alike. To assist in the banishment of this error by showing a more excellent way is the aim of this little book." Hence the main contention is pushed with vigor in the four relations of "God and Nature," "God and History," "God and the Bible," "God and Religion."

Professor Bowne gives us here no philosophy of "the immanence of God," but, taking this for granted, he undertakes to show how the want of this philosophy is the pit of folly and error into which religion and science are both largely plunged, while the acceptance of this philosophy will at once easily set both on the highway of light and consistency. The deistic conception of things is still all too prevalent, to be sure, but is by no means so rampant and destructive of sanity as the professor imagines. Nor is his theory of divine immanence such a "new conception" as he imagines. It is a common fault of progressive thinkers of our time to fancy themselves far in advance of the common crowd and by consequence do they berate and commiserate the slow-witted and hoodwinked multitudes who see not the glories of "new truth" from the "new standpoint." A truly admirable and stimulating book here suffers from the constant obtrusion of these faults.

The immanence of God is by no means a "new conception" nor are there wanting to our lonely prophet the *seven thousand* undefiled capable of fellowship with a pure worship.

Put aside this fault of assumption and the style of the work is splendid and its message timely. Idealism in philosophy has triumphed completely over materialism and supernaturalism has naturalism on the run at every citadel. So soon as supernaturalism comes to understand itself and gets itself understood it will rule men's minds in peace and energy. Professor Bowne is helping toward this when he contends so earnestly for explaining all

things as the manifestation of the vital presence of God, for "this term supernatural has so many misleading associations, and is still subject to so many misunderstandings," that we would do well to abandon it altogether and in its place write God.

Yet have we somewhat against our teacher. If the deistic conception in science and religion is half so prevalent as he charges, and that is about the real situation, then he would better have told his readers a little of what the "new view" is, for some will need to know. And to be sure not every conception of the philosophy of the divine immanence is the same and no reader of this volume alone would know just what doctrine is urged upon him. Is God limited to his universe or has he something still of transcendence? Is his immanence that of identity or of support? Has he independent personality or is he personalized in his work? These questions may be discussed metaphysically and so rightly find no place in the plan of our little book; but they must be discussed practically and so should come before us here.

Again in making the natural supernatural and putting every smallest fact and change on the very hand of the loving God, a goodly service for a philosophical teacher, shall we leave our God free to do still some unusual thing that shall surprise us into a new consciousness of his presence and love, or his displeasure, if need be?

The book is defective more than faulty, erring more in what it fails to say than in what it does assert. When, however, we come in the last paragraph to read that "this thought of the divine immanence" must be united "with the thought of law;" that "all is law; all is God. All is God; all is law," we have an uneasy fear that our *teacher* is forging chains for the Divinity he has brought so near. At least do we suspect that he is cutting the motor nerve of that inspiring imagination he has been so well developing. One needs to keep in view the query whether a God in law alone can ever be a God certainly known. Truly God can be guilty of no *lawless* act but it is no superficial distinction when we know concerning God of

a law of himself and a law for himself. He is as near us in the one as in the other, but could not be practically known in either without the other.

One more complaint we must be permitted to lodge: It seems to be assumed that God's method is the same in nature, history, the Bible and religion. This should be left for investigation and not assumed *a priori*. It might turn out that a reason for manifestation of himself in the Bible is the inadequacy of the method of nature and history for the needs of religion, and so that the method is different here. So, too, the explanation of the way to become religious is vague, if not in conflict with the teaching of Jesus. But we come back to renewed commendation of the book. Our generation needs the lesson of its main contention. Every generation needs it. And, truly, if we can learn how near God is to us in all that we see and do we shall know, with blessedness, how near he is when we call upon him. W. O. Carver.

VIII. STUDIES IN PALESTINE.

The Jordan Valley and Petra.

By William Libbey, Sc. D. and Franklin E. Hoskins, D.D. Two Volumes. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905. $6.00.

These sumptuous volumes from the Knickerbocker Press, New York, represent the results of the valuable work of two experts, one Professor of Physical Geography in Princeton University, the other for twenty years an American missionary in Syria. When the two writers were in Princeton twenty years ago, one as professor, the other as student, they formed a compact to visit Petra and the region East and South of the Dead Sea. In the meantime Dr. Hoskins, engaged in his lifework in the Syria mission, at Beirut, had the advantage of becoming acquainted with the Arabic language, the people, much of the land, and, not least among other advantages, of knowing the government officials, whose aid and favor made the trip at last possible under the most auspicious circumstances. When the dream became a reality it

involved over six hundred miles on horseback, but was an ideal trip, though taken in the rainy months, February and March. Forty-one days were spent between Beirut and Jerusalem, thirty-four of them East of the Jordan; not a man or animal fell ill, or suffered from accident, carelessness, or theft; they never missed their road, or pitched their tents in darkness; they ate game from Banias to Jerusalem, and with one or two exceptions enjoyed hot food at every noon-day meal! How all this was achieved, and with what rich results, is made to appear in a story which is always interesting and informing and at times little short of thrilling.

Professor Libbey's purpose was, first, to study the valley of the Jordan from beginning to end. They planned, accordingly, to cross and recross it as many times as possible between its cradle and its grave, then push eastward into Moab and southward into Edom. What they actually did was to leave the sea at Sidon, climb over Lebanon at an altitude of 4,100 feet, catch a magnificent view of the general configuration of Southern Lebanon, the Upper Jordan, and Galilee, before they descended into the valleys of the Litany and the Jordan to examine them in detail, circle the waters of Merom, cross over the Jordan at *Jisr Benat Yakub,* pass down to Galilee by boat from Tabigha to the entrance of the Upper Jordan, go around the sea of Galilee on the West, across the Jordan again to Gadara, then down the Eastern Range through Ajlun, Gilead, Moab, and Edom to Petra and Mount Hor. On their return journey they made a descent into the Arabah, went around the Southern end of the Dead Sea, up and across to Hebron, then Northward to Jerusalem, and back again to the Jordan at Jericho. This made a journey into regions of country, and of history, as the work proves, that are far from the beaten lines of tourist travel and thought; and these volumes give us, not only a record of the journey of permanent value, but a contribution to the geology and natural history of the land, a valuable addition to our knowledge of the country through which and into which the

Children of Israel came after their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, and a useful and illuminative guide to regions not often visited even by scholars bent on research, and forming to the general reader a veritable *terra incognita.*

The first volume tells the story of the trip from Sidon on the seacoast through all its stages to Kerak, east of the Dead Sea in Edom. The second carries us on through all the remaining stages back to Jericho, giving us a surpassing apocalypse of Petra and the region south of the Dead Sea. The work abounds in photographic illustrations of the first order. Finer we have never seen. The list of illustrations covers seven pages. Valuable appendices are devoted to a table showing the "Traveling Time" of the party, "Barometric Elevations," "Travelers to Petra," "The Hedjaz Railroad," "The Mosaic Map of Madeba," "Scriptural References," and "Fossils Collected." A full and accurate index and a clear and up-to-date map showing the route taken, add to the value and utility of the work. The temptation is strong to give some sample quotations showing the scientific thoroughness, the engaging style and at the same time the popular quality of the book. Lack of space only prevents.

GEO. B. EAGER.

A Pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

By Charles Gallandet Trumbull. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. 1905. $2.50.

This is one of the many books that have been the outgrowth of the great world Sunday-school Convention in Jerusalem. It is a worthy attempt by the well-known editor of *The Sunday-school Times* "to make the Holy Land real to those who, while perhaps not being in doubt as to its existence, yet think of it more as a land of the Bible than as a present-day fact in the kingdom." One of the charms of childhood is that it is a time of first impressions. This book preserves for us in attractive and permanent form much of the charm of first impressions, not only of the great cruise and the convention, but of the

Holy Land, "as a present-day fact in the kingdom." Mr. Trumbull is a traveler after our own heart. To the well-stored mind and sensitive loving heart, he added the open eye and the ready pencil. Then as a wise editor he pressed others into service, and so the book is a sort of symposium. Rev. Henry Clay Risner gives interesting "Glimpses of Baalbek," Joseph Clark, D. D., tells of "Hebron and the Patriarchs," "The Mystery of the Cave of Machpelah," "Solomon's Pools," etc.; Rev. Everett Gill writes for us of "Gezer and Its Excavations," "Excavator Macalister," etc.; Rev. Junius W. Millard recalls "Hundred-Gated Thebes," and tells of "Luxury and Luxor," "Karnak and the Donkey Boys," "Braving Upper Egypt," etc. Incidentally much light is thrown upon Scripture texts, and old facts and truths are made to stand out with new clearness and lustre. The work is richly illustrated, too, with well chosen photographs taken by the author. As compared with such works as those of Robinson, Thomson, Conder, Tristram and George Adam Smith, for the treatment of the great questions with which they are specially concerned, the work is ephemeral. But it deserves, and doubtless will have, a wide reading. GEO. B. EAGER.

IX. NEW TESTAMENT.

The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.

By William Sanday, DD., L.L. D. Litt. D. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Price $1.75 net.

This new volume from Dr. Sanday is due to an invitation to deliver the Morse Lectures before Union Theological Seminary, New York, in November, 1904. There is no man who is better qualified to speak on this subject than Dr. Sanday, for it has possessed a lifetime interest for him. One of his earliest books was on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is only a little over a year since Principal James Drummond, D. D., of Manchester College, Oxford, published his massive defense of the Johannine authorship of this Gospel. These two

books effectually check the recent effort to discredit the genuineness of the Gospel. Dr. Drummond indeed devotes himself largely to the external evidence while Dr. Sanday discusses almost exclusively the internal aspects of the question.

Dr. Sanday's volume is briefer and more readable than Dr. Drummond's and puts the core of the problem in more succinct form. Dr. Sanday is, of course, thoroughly familiar with all the critical theories concerning John's Gospel and gives a masterly survey of the numerous hypotheses with occasional sharp thrusts at uncritical critics or the hypercritical ones. He defends the use of "apologetic." He says: "There is an impression abroad—a very natural impression—that 'apologetic' is opposed to 'scientific.'" He adds: "We are all really apologists in the sense that for all of us some conclusions are more acceptable than others." The volume teems with quotable passages and its reading would serve as an admirable course in the principles of criticism. In fact the last pages of the book are devoted to a brief statement of sound critical principles.

The mind of Dr. Sanday is eminently fair and balanced. He sees all sides of a question and frankly admits what truth an opponent may have on his side, sometimes he admits too much apparently. This tendency leads to a frequent qualification of his statements, so anxious is he not to overstate the facts. The most striking illustration of this tendency appears in the hesitation of Dr. Sanday to conclude that the author of the Gospel was an Apostle. He says: "I purpose to defend the traditional view, or (as an alternative) something so near to the traditional view that it will count as the same thing." This "something so near" is the view of Delff that the "beloved disciple" and author of the Gospel was not John the Apostle, but a member of the high priestly family at Jerusalem and not a fisherman at all. This would accord with John 18:15, but the objections to it are insuperable. For instance, we have then to suppose; (1) that this disciple, though not an apostle, was continually with the

apostles even during the last night in the upper room; (2) that, though not one of the inner circle (Peter, James and John) who were in the house of Jairus, on the Mount of Transfiguration, in the Garden of Gethsemane, yet he deserved to be called repeatedly "the disciple whom Jesus loved;" (3) that, though all this is true, he is never mentioned a single time by the synoptic Gospels as in company with the Apostles; (4) that this "beloved disciple" and author of the Fourth Gospel studiously avoided the mention of the name of John thoroughout the entire Gospel for no apparent reason; (5) that this "other disciple" is mentioned frequently with Peter (John 18:15; 20:3; 21:7, 29) just as the synoptic Gospels and the Acts represent Peter and John (Luke 22:8; Acts 3:1). The late tradition about the death of James and John at the same time is not enough to weaken the force of the above facts and does not justify the alternative in Dr. Sanday's conclusions. He falters in the final step where he should, I think, go the full length as does Dr. Drummond. I think also that Dr. Sanday is too certain that John and the synoptics are at variance as to the date of the Last Supper. It is pleasing to see that Rev. David Smith in his recent great book, "The Days of His Flesh" (p. 536f.), contends that John is in harmony with the synoptics. Once more, I think that Dr. Sanday concedes too much when he admits that John has "colored" the description of Jesus by John the Baptist as "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." That idea is in agreement with Isaiah 53. We can not admit that John the Baptist was as ignorant of the Scriptural teaching as the rabbis. The same thing applies to the early confessions of Jesus as the Messiah at Bethany beyond Jordan and at Sychar in Samaria. In both instances they were private confessions and after the hostility to Christ broke out in Judea and John the Baptist was imprisoned, it was plain that no occasion for similar professions must be given as the disciples also seemed to cease baptizing. Besides Jesus acted so little like the popular ideal of the Messiah that doubts might naturally arise as was true

with John the Baptist himself. It is by no means clear, therefore, that John's presentation of the early witness to Jesus as the Messiah is not strictly correct. John and the synoptics both agree in putting the fuller recognition of Jesus as the Messiah of the Apostles after the close of the Galilean ministry.

But with the general course of the argument I find myself in hearty agreement and the book is invaluable to every intelligent student of the Gospel of John. Dr. Sanday has the respect of the critical world and has to be reckoned with. He is not decided that the Apostle John was not the author. He is on the whole inclined to think that he was, but he balances that view with the other that the evident eye-witness was a member of the apostolic circle though not John himself. That alternative I believe untenable and the removal of it leaves John himself as the author. The theological world owes much to Dr. Sanday for this really great contribution to a vital theme.

A. T. Robertson.

The Days of His Flesh. The Earthly Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

By the Rev. David Smith, M. A. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905. Pages 549.

The *British Weekly* hails this book as the new Farrar, one that is abreast with present day criticism and without his rhetorical excesses. There is much to be said for such a statement. The author has a wonderful charm of style. His language is flowing, but not florid, simple though not superficial. He has the modern spirit and approaches the problems in the Life of Christ from the point of view of the critical scholar. And yet his reverence for Christ is absolute. He takes him as God and Savior without hesitation. He stands by the Virgin Birth and the real Resurrection of Christ from the grave. He accepts miracles like the raising of Lazarus. He accepts the genuineness of the Gospel of John though in the opening chapter on the evangelic records he is very free in his views concerning untrustworthy elements in the Gospels.

He is entirely too certain of his position on many critical points. Mr. Smith even identifies Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany and the woman that was a sinner, following Roman Catholic tradition. But Mr. Smith is right in holding that John used Roman time in his Gospel, as indeed it is necessary to see from John 20:19, "When therefore it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week, etc." This was evening after the day. Now the Jews counted night and day. "On that day" is the Roman, not the Jewish reckoning. It is pleasing to know also that Mr. Smith sees that John and the synoptics are in harmony as to the day of the crucifixion. Scholars have been fond of saying that John or the synoptics must be wrong, some taking one side, some the other. He makes precisely the line of argument pursued in my notes on this point in Broadus' Harmony of the Gospels. Mr. Smith is full of patristic lore and enriches his pages also with apt quotations from the Talmud. Barring some points in the chapter on the Evangelic Records there is not much in the book to object to and a very great deal to commend. The book is, of course, designed for those who have some scholarly taste and yet it is written in a popular style and is bound to appeal to a very wide public. Mr. Smith is the United Free Presbyterian minister at Tulliallan, a small Scotch town, but this great book will carry his fame all over the world. There are many telling sentences here and there that linger in the mind and heart.

A. T. Robertson.

Jesus and the Prophets.

By Charles S. Macfarland, Ph. D. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905.

This book purports to be "an historical, exegetical and interpretative discussion of the use of Old Testament Prophecy by Jesus and of his attitude toward it." The author has a fine field of work and he has done much helpful service, but he is too sure that the Gospels "mar their interpretations of Christ's words" and "are misled by their effort to find in this a fulfillment of an Old

Testament prediction." The book is reverential toward Christ, but unsympathetic toward the Scriptures. The quotations of the Old Testament in the New constitute a very important and difficult problem. This book has rendered some important service, but its rules of interpretation are too hard and fast to cover all the facts.

A. T. Robertson.

The Creed of Christ.

By John Lane. The Bodley Head, New York. 1905. Pages 220.

This is a very remarkable book. Dr. R. J. Campbell, of London, says that it is as remarkable in its way as Ecce Homo. There is genuine freshness of treatment that is very attractive. The anonymous author is daring in his criticisms. He boldly sets up his own criteria and brushes aside whatever does not square with this standard. He considers the Fourth Gospel merely Greek speculation of a mystical disciple of Christ who "never, or very seldom, makes him (Christ) give utterance to the beliefs that really ruled his heart." He charges the synoptic Gospels also with putting into Christ's mouth the very opposite of what he believed, though on the whole he has a higher opinion of the synoptics than he has of the Gospel of John. He says that we know at least two things clearly about Jesus; viz: he hated the Pharisees and he loved the Kingdom of God. "Whatever in the recorded sayings of Christ seems to blur or distort this figure, I regard with suspicion; whatever obliterates it, I regard as false." But the writer has too narrow a conception of Christ and fits everything into a mechanical mould. The author evidently considers Christ only as a man, a prophet and a poet. He says that a hundred thousand years from now Christ's name may be forgotten and yet the world be more Christian than ever. He says that the supernatural world is doomed and that God and nature are one. These extracts will give some idea of a book as remarkable for its boldness and charm of style as for its failure to grasp the spirit of Jesus. It is certainly not the creed of Christ that is here set forth, though the book

itself commands attention by its vigor and courage. If you wish a good jolt and shaking up, this is the book for you. You will recover your equilibrium.

A. T. Robertson.

The Creed of Christ. A Study in the Gospels.

By Rev. Richard Venable Lancaster. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. 1905. Price 60c.

This is a popular book but it is the result of real study of the Gospels. The author seeks to unfold the mind of Christ and he does it in no merely perfunctory way. There is little that is new in the book, and yet the total effect is one of much freshness. Mr. Lancaster does not decide what Jesus knew or did not know. He actually lets Christ speak for himself. He takes all that Jesus says on the most vital problems and sets it before us in clear language. And it is convincing. Mr. Lancaster is a safe guide to the creed of Christ. There is as little as possible of Mr. Lancaster about it. This is the fresh point about the book. It is a book for those who wish to know what Jesus said his creed was rather than somebody's idea of that creed. It is a helpful little book. It is abrupt at some points, but usually the style is clear enough.

A. T. Robertson.

Jesus of Nazareth, the Anointed of God.

By P. Cook, M. A. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, etc. 1904.

Originally a lecture this booklet still retains the lecture form. It is an effort to give a connected and vivid account of the life and teachings of our Lord in as brief a space as possible—to present him as he appeared to his friends and disciples rather than in his significance for doctrinal theology. The sub-title is suggestive, "The Inner History of a Consecrated Life." The author believes that to portray the high nobility of the personality of Jesus and the stainless purity of his life, is likely to prove more useful to this generation than to make of his life "mere building-stones for a doctrinal system." He hopes that in a day when men are weary of ponder-

ous volumes, this unpretentious narrative may find a welcome by reason of its brevity. He claims to find in the four Gospels "historical sources" "in accordance with the assured results of modern scholarship." He has accorded the Gospel of Mark and the material common to Matthew and Luke generally called "Logia" the pre-eminence. He ignores critical questions, passes over the Introductory Matter and Infancy Narrative of the Gospels, announces that he is dealing with no "fairy tale," no "fabled personage beyond the pale of history," and with evident mental and moral earnestness proceeds to deal with the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus as *facts,* and facts of profound and vital significance to the race. After surveying and portraying the life so as to carry over into the picture-narrative all the really significant events of the public ministry, the death and the resurrection of the Christ, he abruptly concludes: "Thus he lived, thus he died, and thus he rose again and ascended to glory." Barring some turgid rhetoric at points, and some rather strained "preachments," he lets the life thus told, speak for itself.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Lynching of Jesus.

By E. T. Welford. Franklin Printing Co., Newport News, Va. 1905. Price 50c.

The first chapter of this book is a discussion of lynchings in this country and shows that only a fifth of them are for assault on women. This just condemnation of lynching is well and good. But there is no special connection between this and the trial of Jesus. The Sanhedrin did excite the mob to clamor to Pilate for the crucifixion of Christ, but after all it was Pilate who said the word of approval though under protest. The Sanhedrin had already condemned Jesus to death though they violated many of their own legal rules in so doing. The condemnation of Jesus is the legal crime of the centuries, but it hardly deserves the modern term of lynching. The book is full of spirit and life, but not of sober criticism.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Christianity of Christ and His Apostles.

By J. J. Tigert, D.D., L.L. D. Publishing House of the M. E. Church South, Nashville, Tenn. 1905. Price 80c.

This is not a book on Biblical Theology, but "historical studies of fundamental New Testament problems." Dr. Tigert is the editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*. He has written a candid and courageous review of the present situation in Christianity in the light of modern criticism. Dr. Tigert is a conservative who has faced the objections of radical criticism and who still believes that Christ is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth. This book is virile and convincing. He handles men like Pfleiderer and Wernle rather roughly, calling them "traitors in the camp" and on the way to atheism. But it is a wholesome tonic to read a book with full knowledge of the reason for the hope that is in the author. It is certain that Christianity will weather the storm of radical criticism, will in fact come out into a clearer place than ever before. Dr. Tigert's book will help those meanwhile who need bracing.

A. T. Robertson.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning Christian Conduct.

By A. C. Zenos, D.D. The American Tract Society, New York. 1905. Price 75c.

Prof. Zenos has the chair of New Testament Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational). He is a thorough scholar of conservative tendencies and has given us a most readable and wholesome book. Dr. Zenos has a sane outlook upon ethical questions and makes no apology for exalting the ethical teaching of Christ to the supreme place. He gives conclusive reasons for that position. This book is free from technical phrases, while full of thought, and will do the average man more good than the more abstruse treatises. This entire series will be found useful to the advanced course of Sunday-school lessons for 1906 on the Teachings of Jesus. It is a fine thing to do to accent the words of Jesus concerning righteous living and Dr. Zenos has done that with skill and judgment. A. T. Robertson.

St. Paul the Master-Builder.

By Walter Lock, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford. Methuen & Co., 36 Essex Street, London, W. C., England. 1905. Pages 124.

The first addition of this charming study of Paul appeared in 1899. It is a satisfaction, though not a surprise, to know that a second edition is called for. Dr. Lock discusses Paul as The Missionary, The Ecclesiastical Statesman, The Ethical Teacher. The scholarship of Dr. Lock is profound, the style simple and direct, the point of view practical. He speaks a wise and a strong word for those who wish a clean-cut picture of the leading facts in the great Apostle's life and work. It is seldom that one finds so small a book with so much wisdom and ripe scholarship. Dr. Lock has a candid mind and a balanced judgment that command assent. I wish the book might have a wide circulation in America. Dr. Lock himself is a teacher of rare skill and attractiveness and this volume shows him at his best.

A. T. Robertson.

The Representative Men of the New Testament.

By George Matheson, D.D. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905. Price $1.50.

Dr. Matheson, the famous blind preacher of Edinburgh, has done a real service in carrying out the Representative Men of the Bible Series. He has now produced two volumes on the Old Testament and one on the New Testament. The studies in the Portrait of Christ in two volumes almost made a sensation by the originality and charm of his conceptions. Perhaps no living man has quite so penetrating an insight into Scripture characters as he. There are Dr. Alexander Whyte, of Edinburgh, and Dr. F. B. Meyer, of London, who have done excellent work, but Dr. Matheson has a quality all his own. There is indeed a sameness of method in all his books, though each character is quite distinct. He has a kind of sense for the distinct quality in a man. He seizes upon that and makes it stand out clear and sharp. John the Baptist he calls John the Expanded and John the Evangelist, John the Surrendered. No description is bet-

ter than Paul the Illuminated, though Barnabas the Chastened and Mark the Steadied are delightful. Matthew the Exalted and Cornelius the Transplanted also challenge attention. The prayer at the close of each discussion has a wonderful sympathetic touch and reverential feeling. The book is really so suggestive that it palls on one after awhile. It is best not to read it all at once, but a character at a time . A. T. ROBERTSON.

Complete Index to the Expositor's Bible. Topical and Textual.

By S. G. Ayres, B. D., Librarian of Drew Theological Seminary. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905. Pages 312.

This volume adds much to the handy efficiency of the Expositor's Bible. A General Preface to the entire series has been provided by the editor, Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll. Prof. W. H. Bennett, of New College, London, writes the Introduction to the Old Testament section. He makes a plausible plea for the new views of the Old Testament. Certainly there is much less objection to criticisim than formerly, but Prof. Bennett rightly admits that the critics hinder their own cause by their numerous disagreements. The majority of the books in the Old Testament section of the Expositor's Bible follow the new criticism. But it is too soon to say that their views will be final. There will inevitably come a soberer reaction that will be nearer the truth as has already happened in the New Testament field. Prof. W. F. Adeney, Manchester, England, who writes the, Introduction to the New Testament section points this out well. He gives a fair and just survey of the New Testament problems of the present day as well as the progress made. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Isle That Is Called Patmos.

By William Edgar Geil. Marshall Brothers, London.

Dr. Geil made two trips to Patmos and gathered the most important facts about the present condition and history of the island. He gives abundant illustrations of the life of the people at the present day. Mr. Geil has traveled much and his books have the element of life

though also of haste. He is addressing himself to present readers rather than to permanent value. He is the author of "A Yankee on the Yangzte," etc.

A. T. Robertson.

The Student's Chronological New Testament.

By Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York and Chicago. Price $1.00 net.

Professor Robertson has given to the public in this admirable manual the results of long and patient research in the New Testament. The introductions to the different books are brief, but quite comprehensive, few matters of importance being passed over in silence. The outlines of the various books are in themselves an interpretation of the thought, and are expressed in a fresh and suggestive way. The author often packs into a short, ringing sentence the ripe results of long research.

The chronological arrangement is not rigidly carried through, but is modified by practical considerations. Thus the four Gospels are placed at the beginning, inasmuch as the story of our Lord's life lies at the foundation of New Testament Christianity. It is only in the epistolary literature that the order of composition is carefully observed in the arrangement of the literature. Pastors and Sunday-school teachers will derive much profit from the constant use of this excellent manual. The text used is that of the American Standard edition.

John R. Sampey.

X. MISCELLANEOUS.

The Baptist World Congress. Authorized Record of Proceedings.

London, Baptist Union Publication Department. 1905. Pages 346.

Rev. J. H. Shakespeare furnishes an introduction that sets forth admirably the spirit of the great meeting held in London last July. The volume is a verbatim report of everything said and done and forms a book of the greatest interest to every intelligent Baptist. There are numerous pictures of prominent Baptists from all over the world. The significance of this first Baptist World Congress will only be fully appreciated in coming years.

It has made history and will make more.

A. T. Robertson.

Carpenter's Geographical Reader—Africa.

By Frank G. Carpenter. Cloth, 12mo, 336 papes. With maps and illustrations. Price, 60 cents. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

This is the latest edition to the popular and widely-used series by this well-known traveler and writer. Carpenter's African Reader is largely based upon explorations, and also upon the author's travels and personal observations in all parts of the continent.

The book is a personally conducted tour, in which the children, accompanied by the author, travel through Africa studying the geographical, commercial and industrial features of the continent as they go. They explore the great mountains; they ride in caravans across the Sahara; and see for themselves the wonders of the Nile, the Niger, the Kongo and the Zambesi while sailing upon them. They study the strange people of the various countries and learn about the birds and wild animals by seeing them in their native haunts.

A. T. Robertson.

The Cyclopedic Handbook to the Bible. An Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture.

By the Late Joseph Angus, M. A., D.D. Revised Edition. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 1905.

In spite of the years of discovery and research resulting in a wealth of literature shedding light on the Bible since the publication of Dr. Angus' *Bible Handbook* in 1853, it is believed, and not without reason, that the *Handbook* still holds an unchallenged place among aids to the interpretation of the Scriptures, by the bold comprehensiveness of its plan, carried out with rare good sense and scholarship and profound reverence for the Bible as the Word of God. In this re-issue we have a new edition, thoroughly revised and in part rewritten by Samuel G. Green, D. D., an English scholar and author of note, who received valuable assistance from Prof. S. W. Green, M. A., of Regent's Park College, University of London, and the late Rev. W. H. Beckett, of Chelmsford. The original

plan has been substantially retained, but with some rearrangement, while the matter of the book as the changed conditions demanded, has been freely dealt with. Much has been rewritten, and not a little added, in the light of the later scholarship, and much omitted as superseded. The book is, therefore, a combination of old and new, and in places the seams show quite distinctly. Nevertheless, in spite of any drawbacks or limitations yet discoverable in it, it is a most valuable popular compendium, and, after its more than fifty years of usefulness, will, we are sure, now, with a new lease of life, go on to fulfill the high aim so modestly stated in the original preface, to teach men to understand and appreciate the Bible.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Animal Heroes.

By Ernest Thompson Seton. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905. Price $2.00.

This delightful volume has over 200 drawings and is fully up to the best of Mr. Seton's work. No higher praise than that can be given, for Mr. Seton has no superior in his own realm. In this book he tells the story of a cat, a homing pigeon, a dog, two wolves, a lynx, a rabbit, a reindeer. Actually one's emotions become so aroused at times in these stories that it is hard to think that the animals are not human. Perhaps Mr. Seton stretches his story a bit, but it makes a mighty good story. And it is worth reading besides, restful and diverting.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Commercial Geography.

By Henry Gannett, Carl L. Garrison and Edwin J. Houston. American Book Company, New York, etc. 1905. Price $1.25.

A text-book for commercial students prepared by three eminent authorities, intended to lead pupils to an appreciation of the physical conditions and economic principles on which depend the successful production, manufacture and exchange of the world's great commercial staples. It is based on the latest statistical information and, it is claimed, accurately portrays the condition of the world's commerce to-day.

GEO. B. EAGER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Sabbat Und Woche im Alten Testament. Eine Untersuchung von D. Johannes Meinhold. Göttingen Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905. pp. 52. Price M. 1.90. To be had through Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

The Book of Ecclesiastes. A New Metrical Translation with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes by Paul Haupt, LL. D., Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins Press. 1905. Price 50 cents, net.

The Prophets and the Promise. Willis J. Beecher, D.D. 8vo, pp., 427. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. Price $2.00 net.

An Introduction to the Old Testament. John Edgar McFadyen. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905. 8vo. pp. 356.

Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament. William Rainey Harper. University of Chicago Press. 1905. Pages 142. $1.00.

The Priestly Element in the Old Testament. William Rainey Harper. University of Chicago Press, 1905. Prges 292. $1.00.

The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses. W. W. Davies, Ph. D. Cincinnati, Jennings & Graham, 1905. Pages 126. 75 cents net.

The Higher Criticism Cross-Examined. F. D. Storey. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1905. Pages 262. $1.25.

Bible History [Old Testament]. Pastor X. Koenig. McClure, Phillips & Co., New York. Pages 190.

According to the Pattern. By Grace Livingston Hill. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1903. $1.00 net.

The Appointed Way. By Hope Daring. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1905. $1.00 net.

Christian Belief Interpreted by Christian Experience. By Charles Cuthbert Hall. The Barrows Lectures, 1902–3. The University of Chicago Press, 1905. Reserved for future notice.

Great Pedagogical Essays. F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D.D. Cloth, 12mo. 426 pp. Price $1.25. American Book Company, Cincinnati.

Rational Living. Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin College. The Macmillan Company. pp. XVIII, 270.

Mohammed and the Rise of Islam. D. S. Margolionth. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. pp. IX, 490. Illustrations and Maps.

Egypt, Burma and Baitish Maylasia. William Elleroy Curtis. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. pp. 400. Map and illustrations. Price $2.00 net.

Der Koran; Eine Apologie des Evangeliums. Gütersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann.

Buddhist and Christian Gospels. By Albert J. Edmunds. Third and complete edition, edited by M. Anesaki. The Yuhakwan Publishing House, Tokyo. For sale in America by the Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. pp. 250. Price $1.50.

Stones in the Rough, or Contributions Toward a Study of Theology, Approached From the Heathen Side of the Fence. William Ashmore. Advance sheets in three parts. Published by A. M. Skinner & Co., Boston.

The Messianic Hope in the New Testament. Shailer Matthews. University of Chicago Press, 1905. pp. XX 330.

Essays in Application. Henry Van Dyke. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905. pp. VIII, 282, 12 mo. Price $1.50 net.

The Spirit of Christmas. By Henry Van Dyke. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905.

The Land of the Gods. By Alice Mabel Bacon; Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; 1905.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit. American Tract Society.

Friedrich Schiller. By Paul Carus, The Open Court Publishing Co.; 1905.

Christianity and Patriotism. By Count Leo Tolstoy; The Open Court Publishing Company; 1905.

The Crown of Science the Incarnation of God in Mankind. By A. Morris Stuart. Andrew Melrose, London; 1904.

The Negro in the Cities of the North. The Charity Organization Society, N. Y.

Baccalaureate Sermons. By Pres. M. Woolsey Stryker. Wm. Smith & Co., Utica, N. Y.; 1905.

Balthaser Hübmaier. By Henry C. Vedder. G. P. Putnam's Sons; 1905.

Ausführliche Grammatik der Griekischen Sprache von Dr. Raphael Kühner, Handsche Buchhandlung, Leipsig.

Neutestamentliche Bibelstunden Gehalten von Dr. H. Hoffmann; A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipsig.

L'Apotre Paul et Jésus Christ, Par Maurice Gognel; Librairie Fischbacher, Paris.

Paulus der Menoch und sein Werk, von Heinrich Weinel, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tubingen.

General Sociology; An Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer. By Albion W. Small, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology in the University of Chicago; The University of Chicago Press; 1905. 739 pp. $4.00.

Jesus Christ and Christian Character. By Francis G. Peabody; The Macmillan Co., N. Y.

Text Book in the History of Education. By Paul Monroe. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.

The Reconstruction of Religious Belief. By W. H. Mallock. Harper & Bros., New York.

The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion. By C. C. Hall. Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago.

The Church's One Foundation. By W. Robertson Nicoll. A. C. Armstaong & Son, New York.

The Presbyterian Christian Endeavor Manual, 1906. J. R. Miller and Amos R. Wells. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1906.

The Westminster Teacher Training Course. Edited by J. R. Miller. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

Certainty of the Kingdom. Ketcham. Jennings & Graham; 1905.

The Unlighted Lustre. Morrison. A. C. Armstrong & Son; 1905.

The Christ of To-day. G. Campbell Morgan. Fleming H. Revell Co.; 1905.

Essentials of Spirituality. Adler. James Pott & Co., N. Y.

Analysis of Gospel of John. Anderson. Newton Center, Mass.

Disciples of Christ. Errett Gates. Baker & Taylor Co., N. Y.; 1905.

History Unveiling Prophecy. Guinness. F. H. Revell Co., Chicago, 1905.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The next regular session will begin October 2d and continue eight months.

Thorough courses of study are given in all departments of theological education.

All studies are elective.

Four degrees are conferred, including a post-graduate degree.

The regular course for the degree of Master in Theology covers three years.

An admirable course of one year in English, without degree, is adapted to the needs of busy pastors who cannot remain for a more extended period.

A great Library is open to all students.

Cost of living in Louisville is not high.

For Catalogue or other information, address

E. Y. MULLINS, President,
Louisville, Ky.

For information as to financial aid, address

B. P. SMITH,
Room 10, New York Hall,
Louisville, Ky.